

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Speaker, if the point of order is insisted on I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has announced that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SEARS. May I propound an inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of no quorum having been made and sustained, the Chair does not think it is in order. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, October 16, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriations for improvement of marine hospitals at Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; New Orleans, La.; New York (Stapleton), N. Y.; San Francisco, Cal.; and Savannah, Ga. (H. Doc. No. 1329), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 13077) providing for the completion of the construction of a bridge across the San Juan River at Shiprock, N. Mex., on the Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 13078) providing a working fund for the treasurer of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 13079) to provide for the construction of a bridge over the Delaware River between the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Resolution (H. Res. 444) for the appointment of a committee to investigate the causes and ascertain the losses sustained by the recent explosion at Morgan, N. J.; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CROSSER: A bill (H. R. 13080) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles V. Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 13081) granting an increase of pension to William M. Nourse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 13082) granting an increase of pension to William Oakley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13083) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Hiram C. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13084) granting a pension to Mary Marley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13085) granting a pension to Emily F. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Springport Grange, No. 1184, of Cayuga County, N. Y., protesting against the zone postal rate on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, favoring widening and deepening the channel of the upper Hudson River in the interest of the development of inland waterways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging Congress to evolve a well-balanced and financially sound revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, October 16, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in heaven, for the sublime faith in Thee, which manifests itself in a thousand deeds of heroism on the field of carnage and in the sacrifices exhibited by all classes, especially the physicians and nurses who are devoting themselves to the preservation of life, the alleviation of suffering, in the terrible scourge which has come upon the people.

Give wisdom to those in authority, courage to those who are battling for the right, that the Christ spirit may be victorious over the foes of liberty and over the terrible scourge which is robbing homes of their dear ones and making desolate the hearts of thousands. Comfort them in the blessed hope of the immortality of the soul and the eternal goodness of God; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the House was kind enough yesterday to give me 40 minutes in which to address the House. If I may get unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, I do not care to take up that time, and I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the Postmaster General and strictures made upon him. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, in view of the character of the address I do not feel that consent should be given—

Mr. BLANTON. I will state that there is nothing personal in my address.

Mr. MONDELL. And therefore I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TAGUE, indefinitely, as he is contesting his nomination before the Ballot Law Commission of Massachusetts; and

To Mr. LUNN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 13086; H. Rept. 830) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, which was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STAFFORD reserved all points of order.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent of the House to take up the bill just reported, notwithstanding the rule.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is the gentleman certain that there is any rule that prohibits the gentleman from taking it up immediately?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not; but it has been a rule of custom, and I would not want to do it over the protest of the membership of the House. But if the House desires, I am prepared to present the bill to the House to-day for consideration.

Mr. NORTON. Has the bill been printed, and is it available for Members?

Mr. SHERLEY. The bill has been printed, and I understand copies will be available for the Members of the House. The hearings are also available.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Kentucky serving notice or asking unanimous consent?

Mr. SHERLEY. I make that request, but the gentleman from Florida desires to present a matter, and I am willing to wait a minute or two for that purpose.

INFLUENZA IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding five minutes, and I ask to have two letters read, which I send to the desk in further support of the remarks I made the other day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for not exceeding five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a minute about a matter of health.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the fresh air abounds in the Hall of the House. In the street cars, the passenger cars, the hotels generally, the windows are open to admit the fresh air. My observation has been, and my experience is, that with an epidemic of this kind raging, after you get the fresh air you are more subject to the epidemic by the cold draft coming into your face or striking you in the back than you would be without the fresh air. I want to draw the attention of the Members of the House to it in the hope that if the House agrees to it the windows may be closed except when it is necessary to have additional fresh air.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to make a statement. The other morning the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] asked unanimous consent that the galleries be closed and that the Speaker be directed to have them closed. Unanimous consent was granted, and the Speaker had them closed. Yesterday several Members came to the Speaker, protesting that by having the windows and doors shut up it made an intolerable condition in the House. So the Speaker, with the Doorkeeper, devised a scheme to obviate that condition. That was to put guards at the foot of the stairs so that persons could not get up to the galleries, and open the doors to admit the fresh air. Where doctors disagree, the Chair does not know what to do.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I spoke of the importance of keeping calm and avoiding hysteria and cooperating with the health authorities in order to control this epidemic. In this epidemic, as in everything else, the middle ground is the safe course. To give you an idea of mistakes that can be made when we are trying to do the right thing, let me say that on a street car the other day it began to rain. It was raining hard and the wind was blowing. They said they could not put the windows down because they had been ordered up. I said: "Well, choose between the two evils. The people were getting wet. Close some windows. Do not let these women and children get wet to the skin, for it may be an hour or two before they get home." It shows that in an epidemic of this kind people are liable to lose their heads and do the wrong thing. The safe thing is to keep the middle ground and avoid extremes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAZARO. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. What is the gentleman's advice? He is a physician.

Mr. LAZARO. I would advise that we have air in here all of the time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] is recognized.

Mr. SEARS rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want to be placed in the attitude of waiving the time which has been allotted me by not objecting. I presume that time is not waived by not objecting.

The SPEAKER. This has nothing to do with the gentleman's time. Is there objection to the gentleman from Florida proceeding for not to exceed five minutes? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, as the Members will recall, I took up the question of additional help being brought to Washington. I did this because, as I stated then, I felt I would be guilty of criminal negligence unless I did all in my power to prevent further congestion. I believe the Members of the House agree with my statement that conditions demand prompt action. I want to commend the newspapers of the city of Washington for the stand they have taken in urging the departments not to bring additional help here. At the time I made the statement before the House I said unless some relief was given I would introduce a resolution, but desiring to be absolutely fair I first wrote the Civil Service Commission and will read the two letters which they sent me, one of them being a copy of a letter which was sent to the heads of the several departments:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., October 14, 1918.

Hon. WM. J. SEARS,

House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SEARS: In reply to your suggestion of October 12 that the commission issue an order restricting appointments of employees for service in Washington on account of the prevailing epidemic, your attention is invited to the inclosed identical letter addressed to heads of departments and appointing officers generally.

Very truly, yours,

J. A. McILHENNY, President.

OCTOBER 14, 1918.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE.

SIR: Upon the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Public Health Service, and the District Health Service that appointments of Government employees be restricted in view of the prevailing epidemic of influenza, the commission has the honor to suggest that the department make requisition upon the commission only for those clerks and other employees absolutely necessary at this time for the maintenance of the war program.

By direction of the commission.

Very respectfully,

J. A. McILHENNY, President.

Mr. Speaker, this does not reach the end that I had in view. If it is left to the heads of the departments to make requests for additional employees, I fear employees will continue to be brought to the District. Not naming the department, while visiting some of the departments yesterday I heard the chief of one of them talking about the additional help they expected to bring in at once or in the near future. Certainly they do not understand conditions prevailing here and the already overcrowded condition which exists. I absolutely agree with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO] that we should not let hysteria carry us off our feet, and that the best way to fight disease is not to become frightened. Perhaps fright causes more deaths than anything else. Since making my remarks on the floor of this House I had occasion to go out and look up a young lady from my home town, having been informed that she was suffering from the disease. I went to the house at which she was stopping and was informed that they had four cases there, Government workers, one of them very low and not expected to live until night. Everywhere we turned on the streets we met funeral processions. I really believe it will be criminal for the Members of Congress to permit additional help to come to Washington until the epidemic is over and adequate accommodations can be secured. Some weeks ago my wife spent the entire afternoon going over the city in our automobile in an effort to secure comfortable rooms for some young ladies from my district but was not successful. Since then, however, they have secured nice rooms.

In view of the above, to permit other girls to come here, with no home to go to, with no heat in the homes which they finally secure rooms in, with no medical attention if they should get sick, is certainly not fair to them. I sincerely trust the heads of the departments will take into consideration the almost impossible task of securing rooms, the appalling death rate, the overcrowded conditions now existing, and that they will not ask for any additional help. If they persist in it, which I am positive they will not do, I shall introduce a resolution. In fact, I shall take the question up with the President to-day and urge him to issue a proclamation stopping further importation of clerical help to the city until the epidemic is passed and the crowded condition is relieved.

I was told yesterday by a reliable citizen that one day this week a father had to build the coffin for his own child; that two brothers had to dig the grave and bury their brother. If that does not show conditions in the District deserve and should receive at our hands some radical action I am greatly mistaken. I do not care to take up more of the time of the House. I sincerely trust the papers will continue their present fight and that the Members, as I shall do, will urge upon the boys and girls in their districts not to be persuaded entirely through patriotism to come here until they can at least be assured they will be properly cared for. I desire also to commend the Civil Service Commission for the stand taken by them, and also their prompt action.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RAKER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from California rise?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes on the aircraft production and in regard to producing spruce timber which is absolutely needed by the Government at the present time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, there will probably be an opportunity when we reach some item in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill to speak on anything that is germane to the aircraft production.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not yield right now. I believe that the House desires to take up this urgent deficiency appropriation bill right now. [Applause.] I have, as the servant of the House, in order to bring it forward, worked every night for the past two weeks until midnight, Sunday included. I am prepared to go forward with the bill if the House is [applause], and now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BLANTON. To either insist upon my time or, first, to prefer a request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I ask for my time.

Mr. RAKER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to cooperate with the wishes of the House, but this is what the Aircraft Board desires—

The SPEAKER. There is a motion pending.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday I was granted time by the House. Yesterday it was agreed by the House that immediately after the termination of the bill then under consideration I should be granted 40 minutes. I ask if it is not in order at this time that the 40 minutes allotted me be granted under the order of the House?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, was not that order predicated upon the idea that it was the order of the day?

Mr. BLANTON. Not at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. And not the order of a subsequent day—the order for Monday, the calendar day?

Mr. BLANTON. No; the RECORD will show that it was to follow immediately at the conclusion of the bill then under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Yesterday the House made a special order modifying the old order that when the bill that was under consideration yesterday was concluded the gentleman from Texas should have 40 minutes in which to address the House.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. WALSH. Will the Chair permit an observation?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Yesterday the gentleman from Texas had the privilege of addressing the House for 40 minutes after the reading of the Journal. A question arose after the Journal was read as to whether or not the gentleman from Texas should immediately proceed, the previous question having been ordered on the Public Health Service reserve measure, and then the gentleman from Texas asked that instead of proceeding, in the absence of any decision by the Chair upon the question which arose, that he might proceed following the disposition of the Public Health Service bill. The original order was for yesterday, and the transfer of his time simply from after the approval of the Journal to after the disposition of the Public Health Service bill, I submit, would not carry the time over to a subsequent day.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, whatever the thought may have been the order is this:

The SPEAKER—

The SPEAKER. Where is the gentleman reading?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Page 11267 of the RECORD of yesterday, October 15:

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 40 minutes after the matter which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has in charge is disposed of. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The last item of business yesterday afternoon was the passage of the bill which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] had charge of, and I submit that that having been the last business conducted the gentleman is entitled to his 40 minutes, and he was recognized on yesterday and only prevented from proceeding by the absence of a quorum. I ask, Mr. Speaker, again that the gentleman from Texas may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon the subject he has indicated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Postmaster General and the strictures which have been made upon him. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in spite of the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee I still have doubt as to whether the gentleman is entitled to time at this time. The gentleman from Texas has had permission before upon two occasions to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Upon one of those occasions it gave rise to serious controversy with his own colleague. Upon the other occasion he peculiarly used the privilege by inserting matters which had nothing to do with the subject for which permission was granted to extend his remarks, and I do not think, in view of that and upon this particular partisan matter which has arisen and which has subsided as far as the House is concerned, that the House ought to permit him to extend his remarks. The House is responsible for this situation, and the House knew when it gave him permission yesterday to transfer the time that this peculiar complication might arise.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman stated just now, as I understood, that the matter had subsided—

Mr. WALSH. As far as he knew, as far as the House was concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Has the gentleman any information as to whether the assault upon the Postmaster General made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is being officially circulated?

Mr. WALSH. In reply to the gentleman, I would say I have no information whether the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota attacking certain happenings in which the Postmaster General seemed to have been implicated has been circulated, nor do I know whether either the reply made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the gentleman's colleague, or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], has been circulated. I have no information upon the subject, but I do submit that the incident, as far as the House is concerned, is closed. We had that dispute the other day. The charges were made, and they were replied to, and it seems to me that this attempt now for an insertion in the RECORD of a supplemental defense by the gentleman from Texas ought not to be approved by the House, and therefore I object.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the question of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the plain language of the order that was read indicates that it should follow the business that day then before the House. It does not make it a continuing order of the House. There is not a word said that makes it a continuing order of the House. I have no desire to interfere with the gentleman from Texas, but I think it is due the House that we proceed with a matter of such great importance as this deficiency bill as early as possible.

The SPEAKER. Now, the Chair thoroughly sympathizes with the gentleman from Kentucky in his position and in his statement, but the House is entirely too loose about making these special orders and unanimous consents. Now, when the gentleman from Texas asked the last time yesterday the Chair was very slow in putting the request, because he wanted to give everybody plenty of chance to object, but nobody objected. It is a unanimous-consent order that when we got through with the bill which the gentleman from Illinois had in charge that the gentleman from Texas should have 40 minutes. Now, there were a hundred men here, and any one of them could have objected, but they all held their peace. The gentleman from Texas.

THE ATTACK AGAINST THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on September 12 the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], in a prepared typewritten speech read on the floor of this House, made against the Postmaster General very grave charges, which, if true, convicted the Postmaster General of being a heartless, cruel, selfish, inefficient, dishonest wretch, and warranted his expulsion from public office for all time to come. By reason of his being an important member of our war Cabinet, and a personal friend and close confidential adviser of the President of the United States, I do

not believe that such charges should remain unanswered in every detail.

Notwithstanding his speech was carefully prepared, type-written, and by him read from manuscript, and he refused all requests to yield to questions seeking at the time to correct his statements, the gentleman before beginning his speech asked for and obtained consent to revise his remarks, which privilege he exercised, by revising his speech before publishing same in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two days later.

The gentleman began by saying:

To win this war completely and speedily should be the sole purpose and the sole endeavor of every American citizen—

Leading us to expect at least that the words he was about to utter would give some inspiration to our armies abroad. But continuing, he said:

At this time—at any time—criticism of a public official is justified only when the public welfare requires it. Especially is this true respecting one who has attained great heights of power. The condition to which our Postal Service has been brought—forced there by the unrelenting and oppressive hand of Albert S. Burleson, the Postmaster General (changed in the revision to read: As it appears by an unrelenting and oppressive system inaugurated by the present Postmaster General)—has become a menace to the Nation's business, to the well-being of our people, and to the welfare of the several hundred thousand employees in his charge.

The occasion of his speech and real purpose of his criticism were gradually unfolded and made manifest as he proceeded, but not until he reached the final paragraph did it appear conclusively that he was merely indulging in cheap politics. I quote it from his original manuscript as read by him, procured from the Public Printer, as follows:

Such is the Burleson attitude toward those who are so unfortunate as to have to work. There has now been placed in his hands the fortunes of 400,000 workers of the telephone and telegraph systems of the country. What is to be their fate? I for one am ready to resolve that the backs of these workers shall never be bared to receive the lash of this modern Simon Legree. There is but one way to stay the hand of this tyrant. Elect this fall a Republican Congress, and that Congress will change the Burleson system, or at least check its further extension. I know of no other way that efficiency may be restored to the great Post Office Department, the well-being of our people served, and three-quarters of a million workers saved from industrial bondage.

Let me read you the following additional excerpts of his speech, from his original manuscript:

From almost the beginning of the Burleson administration we have known something was wrong in the Post Office Department. Recent evidence discloses that conditions there have become critical. The mail system that serves every business, every humble fireside, every brave soldier boy at the front has steadily declined in efficiency, and further demoralization is in progress. Letters sent either fail to arrive or arrive after exasperating delay. It is an everyday, a common occurrence, for letters once posted never to be heard of again. * * * And yet on every hand I find business men complaining of the mail service; families have tried in vain to communicate with absent members; and many a soldier boy in the land "over there" has gone to battle, into that hell of bursting shell, exploding bomb, and deadly machine gun; into that inferno of where the earth beneath him heaves and crumbles, death falls in the track of a thousand volcanoes, and the very air he breathes is poison; gone into battle and died "somewhere in France," and never received the message of love from a praying mother way back home, a message that her old hand penned and tremblingly placed in the mail with a prayer—one Mr. Burleson's system failed to deliver. * * * Investigation discloses that the mail service is demoralized, a demoralization that results from a tyrannical, even brutal, treatment of 300,000 postal employees by the Postmaster General, and from certain policies adopted that seem to ignore all consideration of efficiency. We who knew Mr. Burleson before he became Postmaster General expected that he would administer the office along the narrowest and most bitterly partisan lines. We were in no sense disappointed. He is the arch politician of the time. He can see no proposition except in a bitterly partisan way.

Thus ignoring the fact that we are in war, with our 2,000,000 brave soldiers fighting over scattered battle fronts 3,000 miles away, many of whom scarcely wrote or received letters before the war began but all of whom now write, and have written to them, many letters from relatives and friends, thus increasing the volume of our mails to enormous and unprecedented proportions, and after saddling upon the Postmaster General the responsibility for all delays, without crediting him with any extenuating circumstances whatever, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] presented against the Postmaster General the following 18 additional indictments:

(1) That Mr. Burleson immediately after assuming office falsely asserted through the press that there was a deficit of \$732,301.90 left by Mr. Hitchcock, when in fact there was a surplus of \$219,118.12, being the first time in the history of the country that the Postal Service was self-supporting.

(2) That Mr. Burleson removed all Republican postmasters from office, and then falsely asserted that the department would be conducted on a purely business and nonpartisan basis.

(3) That the President's order which went into effect on April 1, 1917, taking all postmasters out of politics and placing them upon the merit system based upon competitive civil-service examinations, was a mere pretense and make-believe.

(4) That Burleson's system required the Civil Service Commission to place a representative of Burleson on the examining board of three to dominate the board, and that Burleson prescribed the method of marking the percentage to be given for this, that, and the other, enabling the Postmaster General to keep the appointments well in hand.

(5) That the Civil Service Commission has been made an agency of the Postmaster General, its freedom destroyed, and its capacity to act justly and fairly taken away.

(6) That the greatest cause of inefficiency in the Postal Service is Burleson's treatment of his employees. The Burleson mind is the tyrant's mind; the Burleson system the tyrant's system. Almost at once Burleson attacked the workers under him with the fury of a tyrant. Apparently to see workers well paid, contented, and in high spirit, doing their best, drives him to frenzy. There is no length he will not go to prevent it, no height he will not climb, no depth he will not descend.

(7) That Burleson contemptuously ignores acts of Congress; that a few years ago he robbed the rural mail carriers out of the \$100 increase given them by Congress, amounting to \$3,000,000.

(8) That Burleson arbitrarily reduced the salaries of collectors in the City Delivery Service from \$1,200 to \$1,000, and continued the practice even after ordered by Congress to restore it.

(9) That Burleson took from the boys delivering special-delivery letters the 8 cents remuneration they had been in the habit of receiving and put the boys on a miserly salary, or one of his favorite contract systems, as he couldn't endure seeing a boy earn the whole 8 cents the patron had placed on the letter for that purpose.

(10) That substitutes for carriers, who had been hanging between life and starvation, getting 30 cents an hour when they worked, were shovled a little nearer starvation by Burleson, who cut their scanty wages to 27½ cents per hour.

(11) That a cheap labor contract system, without regard to efficiency, always looks good to Burleson, and he has tried his best to have established such a system in the place of the present rural carrier system.

(12) That repressive measures of all kinds have been put into effect; privileges enjoyed by employees, making their work more agreeable and life more pleasant, have all been taken away, and now men are chained to their work, cowed and browbeaten.

(13) That when the National Guard were sent to the border in 1916, Burleson required the many members in the Postal Service to resign their places, depriving their families of means of subsistence.

(14) That Burleson refused to permit a letter carrier to attend his father's funeral.

(15) That Burleson has made it almost a capital offense for a postmaster to be on good terms with the employees of his office, and showers smiling favor upon them for harsh and exacting treatment of employees.

(16) That Burleson hates labor unions, and during five years has not permitted much to remain of the organizations of his employees; that he refused to permit Mr. E. J. Gainer, president of an organization, to attend a convention, and his attitude is important because he is the political dictator of this administration, directing the administration's policies in this regard, and thus likely to affect millions of workers in the land.

(17) That Mr. Burleson is a man of great wealth—perhaps the wealthiest man in this Cabinet—inheriting a large quantity of land in Texas.

(18) That Burleson, with his brother-in-law, operated a farm of several thousand acres in Texas with convict labor hired from the State, and conditions became so unspeakable and, in a legislative investigation, were found to be so monstrous on the Burleson and other farms that all Texas was horrified and the legislature forever prohibited such practice in the future; that the poor wretches who were to toll and suffer to enrich the great Burleson were the young lads whose feet had strayed for the first time and the old men whose faltering steps would soon lead them to the grave, and to these were added those suffering from sickness or bodily infirmity, and the treatment of whom [for which Mr. Burleson was held responsible by the gentleman from Minnesota] was the following: Convicts worked in the morning as early as the guard could see, and returned to buildings between sundown and dark; excessive work and general bad treatment, making wrecks of many strong men; requiring men to run to and from their work from 1 to 3 miles, and while worked pushed excessively; convicts often whipped, using a short handle of wood to which were fastened several straps 5 feet long, each above an inch wide, under which cruel lash the naked flesh was cut and torn, and in many instances the poor sufferer died; B. F. Luce punished 18 licks for laziness, and Joe Oliver 17 licks. Picture, if you can, these tender youths in their teens, these tottering old men, these sick and infirm, with bared backs, receiving the lash for laziness. Little wonder they sank and died. J. C. Zachery forced to wade the river in cold weather of all kinds; P. Hubbard afraid to tell of bad treatment because the punishment would be more severe than he could stand. J. B. Maurice heard the inspector tell the men, "I have turned you all over to Capt. Brooks, and if 20 licks won't do I'll give orders for 120; and if that don't do, by the eternal gods, I will give 1,020. J. S. Lowery knew of guards whipping Foster four or five times a day, and they beat him up until they saw he was going to die, and placed him in a tree infested with ants, which got on him. Behold that picture, if you can. This man, with naked body, torn by lash and bleeding from a score of wounds, compelled to stand on an old stump while ants swarmed over him, crawled into his wounds, and stung his quivering flesh into a frenzy of pain. Three other men murdered there, one that couldn't keep up with the squad, and the guard tied a rope around his neck and tied it to the horn of his saddle. He lived three days. Another, named Dunn, was beaten to death. A Mexican, whipped with Dunn, died this same night. The guard whipped them till they gave out and then tied them down in the field with their faces up to the sun. Mr. Chairman, hell can have no terrors for convicts that toiled and suffered on the Burleson farm. Such is the Burleson attitude toward those who are so unfortunate as to have to work. There has now been placed in his hands the fortunes of 400,000 workers of the telephone and telegraph systems of the country. What is to be their fate? I, for one, am ready to resolve that the backs of these workers shall never be bared to receive the lash of this modern Simon Legree.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have quoted the foregoing excerpts from the gentleman's speech as actually made here on the floor, copying same from his manuscript, because his revision published two days later was materially changed.

Who is this Postmaster General whom the gentleman has so viciously condemned? A member of a family in Texas honorable for generations. He was the assistant city attorney of Austin, the capital of Texas, from 1885 to 1890; was attorney of the twenty-sixth judicial district of Texas from 1891 to

1896; each time without any opposition in his own party he was elected to the Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, Fifty-eighth, Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, Sixty-first, Sixty-second, and Sixty-third Congresses, and while serving in such honored capacity he became the Postmaster General of the United States.

CONVICT LABOR ON BURLESON FARM.

In what manner was Mr. Burleson connected with or responsible for the unpardonable cruelties alleged against him? In what manner did he sin? To utilize its convicts, the State of Texas leased from owners a number of farms, among which was one owned partly by Mr. Burleson. While reciting his condemnation, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] had in his pocket a copy of this lease contract—now printed on pages 10256, 10257, and 11120, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—which, by its specific recitations, proves conclusively that the States of Texas had absolute custody, control, and management of its convicts, worked them under its own guards, fed them, clothed them, disciplined them, and had exclusive operation and care of them, and that neither Mr. Burleson nor any other owner of the land had anything whatever to do with such convicts. No matter how deservedly certain State officials may have merited censure, why should Mr. Burleson be condemned, when he had no knowledge of or connection with the matter, and was wholly innocent of any wrongdoing? He, with another, merely leased their farm to the State of Texas. Mr. Burleson in Washington attending to his official duties had nothing whatever to do with the method the State of Texas used in working its leased land with its convicts.

During his speech, when the gentleman refused to yield to a question seeking to correct his unwarranted accusations against the Postmaster General, I caused a quorum of the House ordered to hear his assertions, because I knew the facts would not support them. Since then I have gone to the trouble to procure from the chief clerk of the Post Office Department the following facts connected with each criticism in detail, and in presenting same, furnished me upon request by the chief clerk of the Post Office Department, I can assure you that said chief clerk vouches for the correctness of each statement made.

TRANSMISSION OF DOMESTIC MAILS.

Reports of the daily operations of the Postal Service show that the mail, though presented in greater volume than ever before in the history of the country, is being handled much more expeditiously than in previous years.

That there has been delay, sometimes quite serious, in the transmission of the mails is a matter of public knowledge, and while it is regretted that there are such delays the public generally thoroughly understands that they are for the most part unavoidable because of conditions growing out of the war and are not due to inefficiency, as some would have the public believe. All of us have experienced some inconvenience. Letters have been delayed and have even miscarried altogether. Who has not expected it, with 2,000,000 soldiers scattered abroad and millions of men and women in America away from their homes laboring in strange places, daily striving to help win the war. With an ordinary laborer earning several times as much as Congress pays to postal employees, almost every department of the Postal Service has had its working force depleted. Many experienced employees have been sent abroad. We should all be patriotic enough to adapt ourselves to war-time conditions and be able to comprehend the difficulties under which every branch of the Government service and every line of business is working, giving all the strength that is in them toward the successful prosecution of the war. The great majority of you patriotic Republicans will not contend that the Postal Service is "inefficient." In order to gain political office and win back the control of this House is it necessary for you Republicans to publicly proclaim to our deadly enemies in Germany and Austria, to our battling allies, and to our brave soldiers in France that a leading Member of the Cabinet of the United States, selected by the great President of this Nation, the confidential adviser of the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, is a heartless, cruel, selfish, inefficient, unreliable, deceitful, dishonest, oppressive, murderous tyrant? Will the loyal, patriotic Republicans of this Nation who are standing behind the President to win this war, approve of such action in this critical emergency by rewarding you with their vote? It can not be expected that the Postal Service will be as perfect or as highly efficient during war times, with all the obstacles and handicaps growing out of the war, as it is under normal conditions.

In spite of the efficient administration of the Government service at this time, or how much money may be expended, it is utterly impracticable to entirely eliminate such delays, whether they may affect the Postal Establishment or some other branch

of the Government service, and it is the part of all loyal Americans to adapt themselves to war conditions and cooperate with the Government and to frown upon the faultfinders.

The people have the right to criticize any branch of the Government, but in war time especially such criticisms to be justified should not only be required by the public welfare, as the gentleman stated, but should be made in good faith, and should be intelligent, honest, reasonable, and just.

SOLDIERS' MAIL.

No responsibility rests, or has rested, with the Post Office Department for delays in soldiers' mail. The Post Office Department established a postal service in France to facilitate the delivery of mail for our Expeditionary Forces. On account of objection on the part of military authorities information as to the location of troops and facilities for the transmission of mail were withheld from the civil postal officials to such an extent as to cause delays in the mail. To overcome this all responsibility for the delivery of mail to the Expeditionary Force in France after leaving the American port was transferred to the Army. The delays that occurred in delivering soldiers' mail when the Post Office Department had charge of it in France was due to the fact that the military authorities felt that the civilian postal employees should not be given military information as to the location of troops, and so forth. In justice to the Post Office Department it must be stated that the War Department, when it did take over the delivery of soldiers' mail in France, had to give to the people who handled the mail identically the same information that they had theretofore declined to give to the Post Office Department. This fact is not to be taken as any criticism of the War Department or the Post Office Department, but simply to explain a condition, namely, that it was finally determined that it was absolutely necessary for the people handling the mail to have this information before it could be delivered promptly. All of this is explained fully in the statement of Capt. Frank E. Frazier, United States Army, which following my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD as Exhibit A.

POSTAL REVENUES.

Under the administration of Postmaster General Hitchcock—Republican—there was an audited postal deficit of \$1,785,523.10 for the year ending June 30, 1912, the year next preceding that in which Mr. Burleson assumed charge of the Post Office Department.

The audited postal surplus June 30, 1913, during the first year of Mr. Burleson's administration, was \$4,510,650.91; in 1914 the surplus was \$4,376,463.05.

For the fiscal year 1915 postal receipts remained practically stationary, due largely to war conditions, whereas normally the increase of receipts each year is about 7.21 per cent. The normal increase would have added about \$21,000,000 to the receipts of the department. In the absence of any increase in the receipts normally to be counted upon naturally there was a deficit that year of \$1,133,308.97.

For the fiscal year 1916 there was an audited surplus of \$5,829,236.07. For the year 1917 Postmaster General Burleson showed there was an audited surplus of \$9,836,211.90.

From 1883, when Postmaster General Gresham—a Democrat under Cleveland's administration—reported an audited surplus of \$2,181,352.57, until 1911 there was a deficit every year during Republican administrations, the smallest deficit being \$2,961,169.91, and ranging from that to a deficit of \$16,910,278.99 in 1908 and a deficit of \$17,479,770.47 in 1909.

For the year 1911 Postmaster General Hitchcock—Republican—reported an apparent—not real—surplus of \$219,118.12. This was a small saving compared with the surpluses of 1882 and 1883, when Postmaster General Gresham—Democrat—reported surpluses of \$1,253,923.57 and \$2,181,352.57, respectively. Since these surpluses, accomplished under a Democratic administration in the years 1882 and 1883, there has been a deficit every year since 1865 until the advent of the Democratic administration of Woodrow Wilson and Postmaster General Burleson, when the several large surpluses hereinbefore specified have been brought about, and at the same time when the Postal Service of the United States is recognized perhaps as the finest of any country in the world.

ONE REASON FOR BURLESON'S UNPOPULARITY—POSTAGE RATES ON SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

The estimated loss to the Government in the difference between the revenue and the cost for transportation for carrying second-class matter was, in round numbers, \$77,000,000 in 1913, \$79,000,000 in 1914, \$81,000,000 in 1915, and \$88,000,000 in 1916, which large sums of money represented a virtual subsidy to publishers. Under the law advocated by Mr. Burleson which became effective July 1, 1918, known as the postal-zone law,

the rate of postage on second-class matter was increased, thereby reducing to a considerable extent the tremendous loss of revenue which had been sustained by the Government, to the benefit of rich publishers, so many years through the handling of this heavy mail matter. If publishers were required to pay the whole cost of handling their publications through the mail, it would easily permit us to adopt a 1-cent basis for letter postage.

REAPPOINTED REPUBLICAN POSTMASTER.

It so happens that in my old home town of Albany, Tex., four years ago Postmaster General Burleson reappointed as postmaster Frank K. Sterrett, a lifelong Republican, who within the last 60 days has been reappointed the second time.

CIVIL SERVICE.

Neither the Postmaster General nor what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], in his revised speech, has termed the Post Office Department "system" intrudes upon nor seeks to destroy the freedom of action of the Civil Service Commission. The Civil Service Commission for its own convenience and to facilitate the determination of efficiency selects from branches of the Government service for which examinations are to be held one examiner from that branch of the service having special knowledge of the requirements of the service. This selection is by the Civil Service Commission and is entirely a matter of their system of efficiency and is their usual custom and rule. From a full explanation of the matter, which following my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD as "Exhibit B," I quote the following:

The post-office inspector is an examiner designated by the Civil Service Commission, and in that capacity he acts solely under the commission's direction and control. He does not take part in any way in marking. The inspector makes no report to the Post Office Department. The only report made is a joint report by the representative of the commission and the inspector to the commission. This report is a mere report of facts and contains no recommendations.

The marking is made by the commission at Washington, just as is done in other nonassembled examinations, and is based upon the facts set forth by the applicants in statements of their careers, and the supplemental report of facts set forth in the report by the representative of the commission and the inspector.

There are nearly 3,000 of these boards of examiners required by law, composed of persons already in the service of the United States.

PAY OF RURAL CARRIERS.

Postmaster General Burleson did not ignore or disregard a law with reference to an increase of rural carriers' pay from \$1,100 to \$1,200. On the contrary he has always insisted that Government employees should be justly compensated and the Government should be a model employer. This applies to rural carriers as it does to all other postal employees. The act of March 9, 1914, provided "that on and after July 1, 1914, letter carriers of Rural Delivery Service shall receive a salary not to exceed \$1,200 per annum." The Post Office Department made an adjustment of salaries under this law on the basis of service rendered, which included no reductions in compensation and which made increases based on service rendered as measured by distance of the route, the number of pieces of mail handled, and the number of pounds of matter carried. The increases on this basis, which is believed to be a fair and equitable basis of pay, ranged from \$100 to \$452, as measured by service. Following my remarks I would like to insert in the RECORD as "Exhibit C" an illustration of how this worked out.

While the Postmaster General felt that arbitrary horizontal increases of pay to rural carriers based on mileage alone, without taking into account the nature and amount of service rendered by such rural carriers, was not equitable or fair to the Government, he did not oppose temporary war-time increases.

PAY OF COLLECTORS—CITY DELIVERY SERVICE.

The Post Office Department at no time reduced letter carriers from \$1,200 to \$1,000 for the reason that they were performing collection service only. Letter carriers were reduced from \$1,200 to \$1,100 on account of their inability to perform a reasonable day's work as delivery carriers. In nearly every case in which reduction was made the carrier voluntarily consented to this reduction. In nearly all cases of reduction, it was a question of either reducing or paying a salary commensurate to the work performed or removing the carrier from the service on account of inefficiency. Following my remarks I would like to insert into the RECORD as Exhibits "D," "E," and "F" documents verifying the above.

SPECIAL DELIVERY MESSENGERS.

Special delivery messengers receive 8 cents for each piece of mail so delivered. Experiments were made at several post offices to determine whether or not better service could be given and at the same time easier and better working conditions obtained for the messengers by placing them on a per diem basis rather than on a piece basis, but this did not work

out satisfactorily. A few days after hearing the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] assert "that the Postmaster General could not endure seeing a boy earn the whole 8 cents, hence took from the boys delivering special delivery letters the 8 cents and put them on a miserly salary," a messenger came in my office to deliver a letter, and upon request, he gave me the following statement of facts as they exist, to wit:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 17, 1918.

I, Harry Perskin, state that I am 16 years of age, and reside at 508 Virginia Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., where I have lived during the past three years, having lived in Washington practically all of my life. I am employed by the Post Office Department to deliver special delivery letters in Washington, D. C. During the whole time I have been so employed I have received as remuneration 8 cents for each and every letter I deliver. I work eight hours a day, and am allowed to work overtime if I want to do so to earn extra compensation, but that is left optional with me. I make on an average of \$5 per day. I have always been treated courteously by department officials, and am perfectly satisfied with my job.

HARRY PERSKIN.

SUBSTITUTE CARRIERS' PAY.

The law in effect prior to July 1, 1918, fixed the compensation of substitute carriers at 35 cents and 40 cents per hour. The 35-cent rate was paid to carriers performing auxiliary service—that is, service in addition to that performed by regular carriers. The 40-cent rate was paid for substitute service where the carrier for whom substitution was made was absent without pay. The department at no time during the years that law was in effect paid a rate less than 35 and 40 cents an hour for the respective service. Therefore, any statement that the pay of substitute carriers was cut down from 30 cents to 27½ cents per hour is incorrect and without foundation in fact.

WORKING CONDITIONS FOR EMPLOYEES.

No special privileges for enjoying and making agreeable the work of employees were taken from them, nor has there been any browbeating, chaining, or cowering of employees. Any statement that the department has permitted or condoned such practices is without foundation.

MILITARY LEAVE.

No record was kept of the number of employees who resigned in 1916 to do service in the National Guard on the Mexican border, but all who did so were reinstated upon request after their return. These men were dropped from the rolls temporarily in order that the department might be able to appoint some person to take their places during their absence, thereby preventing the Postal Service from suffering due to the lack of men.

No person has suffered any injustice or unfair treatment by reason of the action taken in this matter. It is not only the desire but the firm purpose of the department to recognize in the most substantial and practical way possible the loyalty and unselfishness of everyone of its employees who offered his services to his country in active military duty as some of those men did on the Mexican border, and as other of our brave sons are doing at the front in France.

LEAVE FOR EMPLOYEES.

The department has no record of refusing to grant a letter carrier leave of absence to attend his father's funeral, and the statement to that effect is unwarranted. The order of the Postmaster General mentioned in No. 13, while denying absence without pay to employees, the practice of the department has been to grant such leave in exceptionally meritorious cases, such as sickness or death in the immediate family. This practice has been followed by the department in every instance, and the department's records show many cases where leave has been granted not only to allow employees to attend a relative's funeral but in instances where it was necessary for a carrier to take his wife or relative to a sanatorium or to a State remote. The department is following this practice at the present time.

TREATMENT OF EMPLOYEES.

Postmasters have never been influenced to mistreat their employees. On the contrary, as stated in No. 15, every possible effort has been made, and will continue to be made by the department, to accord to the employees the fairest and most considerate treatment that is possible. Any statement to the contrary is unwarranted.

POSTAL ORGANIZATIONS.

The department has never at any time opposed organizations of postal employees where their aims have been unselfish and for the improvement and betterment of the Postal Service, but in a few instances where certain organizations, and especially their leaders, misguided, or actuated by selfish motives, have sought to interfere with the proper discipline and administration in the Government service, the department has expressed its disapproval of their conduct. "They should," the Postmaster General has said, "be permitted to form organizations for their social and moral welfare, appear before committees

in Congress, when requested, and give any information concerning the Postal Service of which they may have knowledge." Following my remarks, I would like to insert in the Record as "Exhibit G" such recommendations on pages 31 to 35 of the Annual Report of the Postmaster General for 1917. In a few minutes I hope to revert to this subject and show that the Postmaster General's prophecy was well founded.

LEAVE CASE OF E. J. GAINOR.

No discrimination was made against Mr. E. J. Gainor in refusing him leave of absence. His case came within the general order previously issued which was essential to the efficiency of the Postal Service and which order, in fairness and justice, had to be applied alike without fear or favoritism to all employees. The order of the Postmaster General dated April 6, 1917, reads:

Owing to the many unusual duties which of necessity will be imposed on the Postal Service because of the existence of a state of war with Germany, it is imperative that the department utilize to the fullest extent the services of its experienced employees. It has heretofore been the practice not only to grant employees leave of absence with pay, as authorized by law, but leave of absence without pay when the service would not be seriously impaired. However, owing to the emergency which now confronts us it becomes necessary to cancel all leaves of absence except those granted to employees with pay, those to employees on military duty, and those to employees absent on account of sickness. All other employees on leave without pay are hereby directed to report to their respective posts of duty immediately.

Hereafter leaves of absence will not be granted except for the purposes mentioned above, and all regulations in conflict with this order are hereby rescinded until further notice.

BETTER WORKING CONDITIONS AND SALARIES.

As a matter of fact, postal employees get just whatever salaries Congress provides for them, and the Post Office Department is compelled, under the law, to pay the salaries appropriated by Congress.

In this connection it is proper to emphasize the fact that postal employees are receiving much larger salaries and are enjoying much better working conditions than was ever true under any Republican administration. In addition to the regular and automatic increases in salaries that have come to employees in the Government service under the Democratic administration, Congress has generously appropriated money for horizontal increases. Many instances could be cited where the Democratic administration has provided material benefits for Government employees, among which may be mentioned the employees' compensation act. This does not take into account the very general policy throughout every branch of the service, including the Post Office Department, to improve and make easier the conditions under which the employees work; looking to cleaner and better sanitary conditions, the safeguarding of their health, the protection of their lives, and to making their hours of work easier, more equitable, and just. Never in the history of the department has there been such generous and sympathetic consideration of the employees in the Postal Service as has been brought about under the administration of Woodrow Wilson and Postmaster General Burleson.

HOURS OF WORK, SALARIES, ETC.

The employees of the Postal Service divided into groups, showing the number in each group and the salaries and the number of hours they work, are as follows:

CITY LETTER CARRIERS AND POST-OFFICE CLERKS.

City letter carriers and collectors. Not subdivided: 34,543.

[NOTE.—All salaries of post-office employees, during the fiscal year, of \$2,200 and less are increased \$200, and above that 5 per cent.]

Post-office clerks and supervisory officers.

New grades:	Number of employees.
\$1,000	8,112
\$1,100	2,398
\$1,200	2,310
\$1,300	5,203
\$1,400	16,474
\$1,500	5,180
\$1,600	1,692
\$1,700	876
\$1,800	287
\$1,900	176
\$2,000	156
\$2,200	173
\$2,400	33
\$2,400	55
\$2,500	33
\$2,600	27
\$2,700	21
\$3,000	14
\$3,200	10

In regard to the hours worked by city carriers, postmasters in all cases have been directed to schedule these employees on an 8 in 10 hour schedule. That schedule applies to delivery carriers, collectors, and clerks. In some instances postmasters have exercised their right under the law and with the sanction of this bureau to work clerks and carriers overtime in cases of emergency. That law did not permit, however, to schedule these

employees for a day in excess of 8 in 10 hours, and where it is necessary to work a carrier a greater number of hours, the employee is paid for such overtime at a rate proportioned to his salary.

Emergencies have always arisen wherein it was necessary to employ carriers and clerks more than eight hours a day, and such emergencies will continue so long as the service continues. In most cases clerks and carriers have asked for the privilege of making overtime, but unless it can be shown that this overtime is absolutely necessary and can not be performed by substitutes the requests have been denied.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Number of employees and salaries.

Division superintendent (\$3,250, plus 5 per cent), \$3,412.50	15
Assistant division superintendents (\$2,250, plus 5 per cent), \$2,362.50	15
Assistant superintendents (\$2,350, plus 5 per cent), \$2,467.50	2
Chief clerks, \$2,300	112
Grade 10, \$2,000	379
Grade 9, \$1,900	1,840
Grade 8, \$1,800	446
Grade 7, \$1,700	7,184
Grade 6, \$1,600	739
Grade 5, \$1,500	1,983
Grade 4, \$1,400	3,000
Grade 3, \$1,300	96
Grade 2, \$1,200	34
Grade 1, \$1,100	1,907
Laborers (\$780, plus 20 per cent), \$936	109
Joint employees, \$300 or less	15

HOURS OF DUTY.

The terminal railway post offices and transfer offices in railroad stations are organized on the basis of eight hours a day six days a week.

The railway post-office trains are classified into three classes with reference to the work performed, responsibility, and so forth, viz, class 1, light; class 2, medium; class 3, heavy. In many cases, owing to the varying conditions of train service the needs of the service require that clerks on the trains shall work more than eight hours on the days when they are on duty, and they are therefore given compensatory time off duty. In organizing the clerical force in the railway post-office trains the department endeavors to approximate a daily average of hours of work on the basis of figures six days a week of seven and one-half hours for class A, light; seven hours for class B, medium; six and one-half hours for class C, heavy.

RURAL DELIVERY AND STAR ROUTE SERVICE.

There were 43,335 rural carriers in the service on July 1, 1918, receiving the following salaries:

Number of employees.	
7	\$576.00
32	633.60
126	691.20
297	748.80
166	806.40
90	818.40
87	830.40
85	842.40
25	954.40
203	864.00
49	912.00
50	924.00
77	936.00
49	948.00
5	960.00
395	1,008.00
39	1,104.00
27	1,116.00
20	1,128.00
17	1,140.00
925	1,152.00
2,211	1,296.00
4,616	1,382.40
4,148	1,440.00
6,525	1,464.00
5,490	1,488.00
4,665	1,512.00
4,316	1,536.00
3,494	1,560.00
2,677	1,584.00
831	1,608.00
379	1,632.00
149	1,656.00
109	1,680.00
74	1,704.00
46	1,728.00
1	1,752.00
97	2,044.80
730	2,160.00

It is impossible to determine exactly the time each one of these carriers is employed, as a schedule is fixed for each route varying from 3 to 9 hours.

On the same date there were 10,910 star-route contractors being paid in accordance with contracts and schedule fixed for each route.

THE GENTLEMAN FROM MINNESOTA NOT WITH THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

On June 29, 1918, the President of the United States vetoed the Post Office bill because it contained the retention of the pneumatic-tube system, stating in his veto message:

I am convinced that there is no moral or legal obligation resting on the Government to continue the use of these tubes by rental. * * * There are many reasons why the present pneumatic-tube systems are not efficient devices for the transmission of mail. Among these reasons is their limited capacity, which makes it impossible to use them to meet conditions of emergency. Furthermore, experience has demonstrated that the tubes are unreliable, because of breakdowns and stoppages. During such breakdowns they cease operation for hours, and even for days together, and it is often necessary to dig up the streets to obtain the mail clogged in the tubes. When these breakdowns occur it is necessary immediately to substitute vehicular service, which results in a confusion of schedules and disorganization of the transportation and delivery service and the delay in the forwarding of large numbers of letters. Not only are letters delayed in this way but because of defects in tubes, carelessness on the part of the operators, and accidents of various sorts the tubes soil or damage many thousand letters and in some instances destroy them.

Against the big lobby maintained and pneumatic-tube propaganda circulated here the Postmaster General had dared to recommend the discontinuance of tubes, which immediately made him unpopular with all parties interested in same. On final vote the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], together with many other prominent Republicans, voted to override the President's veto and to continue to expend millions of dollars of the people's money for these inefficient and expensive tubes. Thus in this instance we find the gentleman lined up against the President.

Again, when the President vetoed the Agricultural appropriation bill, because in same the price of wheat had been increased above the sum the President had fixed, on July 13, 1918, we find the gentleman from Minnesota, together with other prominent Republicans, lining up against the President and voting to override him by passing the wheat raise over his veto.

Again, when the President sent his message to Congress on July 1, 1918, stating that he had felt constrained to veto the legislative appropriation bill because it increased the hours of work for Government employees from seven to eight hours, we find the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], who has expressed so much apprehension about this administration not giving the laboring man a square deal, lining up against the President and against organized labor by voting to override the President and to pass the increase of hours' provision over the President's veto. Yet he condemns Mr. Burleson simply because he recommended a policy that would prevent Government employees from striking against the Government. When Congress passed this Borland amendment, requiring the 240,000 Government employees to work eight instead of seven hours, Mr. Gompers and other labor leaders demanded its repeal, and demand was made upon the President to veto the provision, and through the press the employees in war time threatened to walk out and resign their jobs, leaving their Government helpless, just what Mr. Burleson had prophesied against. Though he himself was lined up against organized labor when the crucial test vote came on this proposition, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] found the Democratic President of the United States standing firmly behind the laboring man.

In the Federal Employee, the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, for June, 1918, the vote cast by each Congressman on the Borland amendment, requiring the 240,000 Government employees to work eight instead of only seven hours per day, is given, with the following comment:

If a Congressman's votes and policies have been against the interests of employees this fact should be made known throughout his district, and if he has shown an attitude offensive toward organized labor every voter in his district should know it.

And this red-flag admonition to all organized labor voters was sent broadcast into the districts of the various Congressmen who had dared to vote to require employees to work eight hours a day during war times.

Again, from the September issue of the Federal Employee I quote:

THE DEFEAT OF REPRESENTATIVE BORLAND, AS TOLD BY ONE OF OUR BROTHERS WHO WAS IN THE FRAY—A REMARKABLE DEMONSTRATION OF THE VALUE OF UNION SOLIDARITY AND AFFILIATION.

[By Gilbert E. Hyatt, president of National Federation of Postal Employees.]

Those ultraconservative members of the civil service who have not realized the value of organization, particularly in its inevitable and most beneficial aspect, that of affiliation with the other great organized agencies under the banner of the American Federation of Labor, have been given a demonstration so plain that he who runs may read of what these things mean and of the real spirit of unionism.

No Federal employee is ignorant of the constant persecution of his brothers in the District of Columbia under the guise of establishing what Mr. BORLAND was pleased to name an eight-hour day. The single-minded persistence of the advocate of this measure, culminating in the veto by President Wilson of the appropriation bill carrying the amendment in question, is too well known in all details to need repetition,

but the story of BORLAND's rebuke and defeat by organized labor simply on this ground is a lesson that every member of the civil service should ponder on, for in it is contained the secret of any future defense that they will make and of any future gains for their cause. * * *

An appeal was made to organized labor and every legislative agent in Washington responded. President Gompers sent a scathing telegram to the Central Labor Union of Kansas City (BORLAND's home), and the legislative agents of the railroad brotherhoods went on record in the plainest language. The writer of this article had the honor, as a member of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, of bearing their personal message to the railroad men of Kansas City. As a result the Kansas City central body passed a resolution without a dissenting word or vote at a crowded meeting condemning BORLAND and instructing their legislative committee to organize the campaign for his defeat. A joint committee of railroad men was formed to do a like service for their members, and the outcome was the overwhelming defeat now passed into history. * * *

It should be fully appreciated by the civil-service employees that these men had not one iota of personal interest in the point at issue, and that they had no personal contact with the class of workers attacked. * * * Mr. BORLAND had done many favors of a personal nature for members of organized labor in his district, and many of the men who worked for his defeat expressed friendship for him, but factional alignments, craft divisions, and personal friendships were thrown aside to fight for a basic standard of their doctrine.

I quote the concluding paragraph of the said telegram sent by Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, also published in this magazine, which is as follows:

Let the inspiring word go forth. "We stand by our friends," and administer a stinging rebuke to men of any party who are either indifferent or hostile.

What was Congressman BORLAND's crime committed for which his office was taken away from him as a punishment? He merely asked that Government employees in war times work eight instead of seven hours per day. He conscientiously believed that when we required our soldier boys to work sometimes 24 hours out of the 24, sometimes in trenches drenched and knee deep in mud, on \$33 per month, who, if he momentarily slept from exhaustion or should demand a single dollar more pay, would be stood up against a wall and shot in eternal dishonor, that it was not unreasonable to demand of Government employees, many of whom were filling the jobs vacated by these soldier boys, and who were working under pleasant surroundings and safe environments, that in war times especially they should work eight instead of seven hours. By a roll-call vote the House of Representatives twice went on record supporting Mr. BORLAND in his contention.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WALSH. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is discussing a matter wholly irrelevant to the subject for which he got permission to address the House. He is talking about the defeat of one of his Democratic colleagues from the great State of Missouri, and is not discussing the attack made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] upon the Post Office Department and the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Has what the gentleman is saying anything to do with the Postmaster General?

Mr. BLANTON. In this way, that the gentleman who wrote this article is the president of the National Federation of Postal Employees, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] stated in his denunciation of the Postmaster General that the Postmaster General was the enemy of all such organizations, and I am showing that the gentleman from Minnesota himself voted this very same vote against these postal employees which was denounced by the president of this organization.

The SPEAKER. I know; but what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] quoted had nothing to do with the subject matter—

Mr. BLANTON. But it has this connection, Mr. Speaker: The gentleman from Minnesota stated that the Postmaster General was an enemy to all organizations of labor for several reasons, and mentioned them. One of those reasons—

The SPEAKER. But what has Mr. BORLAND's defeat to do with the Postmaster General or with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]?

Mr. BLANTON. One of the reasons given by the Postmaster General in his annual report—I do not presume this is being taken out of my time, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. No.

Mr. BLANTON. One of the reasons intimated by the Postmaster General in his annual report, and as condemned by the gentleman from Minnesota, why a postal clerk should not be permitted to join labor unions or federated unions in any way, was that they would attack Members of Congress for their vote on the floor of the House; that they were engaged in political activities here and in the districts of the Congress-

men; that they would attempt to defeat Members of Congress and Senators who were against their demands.

The SPEAKER. Granting all that, what has the race that Mr. BORLAND made, ending in his defeat, to do with the Postmaster General?

Mr. BLANTON. It shows that the Postmaster General was correct, because the president of the Federation of Postal Employees states that he went into the district of Mr. BORLAND himself; that he gloated over the fact that not only he did it, but the president of the American Federation of Labor sent a denunciatory telegram into that district that caused the defeat of the Member of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is getting farther into the forest, Mr. Speaker; and I submit that the gentleman ought not, when he gets permission to address the House and reply to the attack made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], to then take opportunity to gloat or to comment upon the felicitous articles and telegrams upon the defeat of one of his Democratic colleagues.

Mr. BLANTON. I approve of the action of Mr. BORLAND. I am not gloating over his defeat. I do not think he should have been defeated on that ground.

The SPEAKER. I know; but what happened to Mr. BORLAND or did not happen to him had nothing to do with the controversy that was precipitated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] touching the Postmaster General.

Mr. BLANTON. The point I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, was that the prediction and prophecy of the Postmaster General came true, in that the heads of these organizations did violate the law concerning political activity by civil-service employees and did go into congressional districts.

The SPEAKER. I know; but that leads up to an entirely different subject, and one that has no limits to it.

Mr. BLANTON. That was a subject matter that was discussed on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]—the action of the Postmaster General, specifically—and it was claimed in his speech that he was an enemy to organized labor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that the campaign in the Jackson County district in Missouri has anything to do on earth with this controversy.

Mr. BLANTON. I was through with that subject, anyway.

The SPEAKER. Well, leave that out and proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Does the Speaker hold that as far as I have gone is—

The SPEAKER. Whatever you read goes into the RECORD, unless somebody moves to strike it out to-morrow.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike it out in so far as the gentleman's remarks pertain to my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The SPEAKER. The very thing he is doing is answering the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. That is what he got permission for.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], with other leading Members on the Republican side, supported this amendment. Coupled with it in the same bill was a provision granting an increase in salary of \$120 to each and every one of the 240,000 Government employees, and of course organized labor made no objection to the increase in salary, and it remained in the bill. Yet, notwithstanding that the law prohibits civil-service employees from engaging in political activity, we find Mr. Hyatt, the president of the National Federation of Postal Employees, in the official magazine of the National Federation of Federal Employees, gloating over his successful political campaign.

Has it been this warning given Congressmen by organized labor which has so suddenly caused the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] to repent of having voted against organized labor, even to the extent of attempting to override the President's veto, and to attempt to make proper atonement to their wrath by heaping infamy upon the Postmaster General of the United States? Are they after the gentleman in his Minnesota district? If they are, this appeal for an armistice will not avail him; he will have to make an unconditional surrender to organized labor.

Was the Postmaster General's warning against political and legislative activity untimely?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. BLANTON. When I get through I will, gladly. I have had a hard time getting this time.

Since war was declared on April 6, 1917, there have been 2,700 strikes in the United States by organized labor.

THE MAIN REASON OF HIS UNPOPULARITY.

On April 1, 1917, the President's order taking postmasters out of politics and placing them upon the merit system, giving to the applicant making the highest grade on competitive civil-service examination the appointment, was put into effect, which was a recommendation made by the Postmaster General. This order has taken our political patronage away from us, and some of us feel chagrined. While such a merit plan was a plank in my platform, still it is a little inconvenient when made an ironclad rule. Since coming here I have asked of the Postmaster General only two favors, both of which were denied. I requested that my particular friend, Mr. W. E. Olive, be appointed postmaster at Slaton, and that my particular friend, Mr. W. B. Martin, be appointed postmaster at Fort Stockton. Both requests were turned down, because the Postmaster General said he must adhere to the rule of giving the appointment to the first eligible certified to by the civil service. [Applause.]

During this war I am for the Postmaster General and every other United States official in whom our President has sufficient confidence to retain in his war Cabinet, whether he does exactly like I want him to do or not, and I am going to try to be patriotic enough myself, and to ask my constituents to be patriotic enough, patiently and uncomplainingly to stand delays and to bear inconveniences, and not to find fault, until we have everlastingly whipped the very "stuffin" out of Germany and her allied military autocracies. [Applause.]

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13086.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the deficiency bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13086, the war deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the deficiency appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for an hour.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill is a war bill. It is presented to the House in order that the Government of the United States may continue to prosecute with the utmost vigor and dispatch the present war in which it is now engaged. In its consideration the committee has taken no thought of recent events, important and momentous though they be. We have prepared the bill with the idea of furnishing the Government the funds for the continuous prosecution of this war with its utmost vigor, and while I shall undertake to explain to the committee cuts that have been made that are large in magnitude, I desire to emphasize the fact that there has not been a denial of moneys anywhere that it was believed were necessary for the prosecution of the war. The committee will be prepared to present reasons justifying every cut that has been made in connection with the estimates that have been submitted to the House. If we have erred at all, we have erred on the side of safety of appropriation, because where there has been a question as to the advisability of voting moneys we have voted them rather than in any way interfere with the continued prosecution of the war.

The estimates that were submitted to the committee total \$8,886,131,651.49. The amounts recommended in the bill total \$6,345,755,666.04, or a total reduction in estimates of \$2,540,375,985.45. These reductions are distributed as follows:

In the Military Establishment and War Department, \$2,447,826,894.86.

In the Naval Establishment and Navy Department, \$17,846,823.

In the civil services, including \$64,000,000 for payment of military and naval family allowances, \$74,702,267.50.

Before undertaking to explain just the nature of these various reductions, it may be well to give to the House a brief summary as to the basis that was used by the departments in submitting these estimates. As the committee is aware, estimates were submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs and to the Committee on Appropriations, looking to the supplying of three armies, roughly spoken of as armies of a million men each; more accurately, perhaps, armies of 1,200,000 men each. The present deficiency estimates were to provide for a fourth army, and contemplate in the service of the United States a total force of 4,850,000 men by June 30, 1919.

It is the present known program of the War Department to have in France by July 1 of next year 80 divisions, and to have in the United States 18 divisions, and there will be called also from time to time such additional men as may be necessary to maintain at their full strength those 80 divisions abroad and the 18 divisions at home, and the estimates are predicated upon that general program.

In order properly to consider these estimates it was necessary to review in large measure some of the appropriations made by the Congress heretofore for the fiscal year 1919, because many of those appropriations were granted after a very brief—necessarily brief—hearing touching the estimates that were submitted. As I shall have occasion later to call attention to a number of overestimates and overappropriations carried in the Army act for 1919, I desire to say now that in making reference to those cases I do not mean in any way to reflect upon the judgment or the industry with which the Committee on Military Affairs performed its work in making the appropriations for the Army. I have had too much experience with the difficulty of the task involved in connection with estimates to be prone to criticize any other committee, and the House will recall that just about the time the Committee on Military Affairs were prepared to report the Army bill there came to them new estimates for the very greatly enlarged program of the War Department, and it was therefore necessary for that committee, within a very few days, to report a bill very much in excess of the detailed estimates that had been presented in the first instance and considered by it; and as a result of that, of necessity they had to accept at their face value many estimates that were submitted and that upon more time for examination it has been determined were in excess of the requirements of the Army.

The quartermaster's estimates as submitted totaled \$2,825,000,000. There has been a reduction made in the quartermaster's estimates of \$1,189,674,774. That reduction is so very large that I feel that the House is entitled to know the reasons why it was made.

Under the head of "Pay of the Army and Commutation of Quarters" there was a reduction of \$18,879,446.80, part of which was made voluntarily by the Quartermaster Department and part as a result of the hearings. Under the law the department has the right to incur deficiencies to any extent necessary to meet the pay of the Army in accordance with its authorized strength and rates of pay. That also applies to subsistence, clothing, and transportation for the Army. The estimates which they submitted for pay of the Army, in connection with what they had heretofore received, have now been revised, with a reduction of nearly \$19,000,000. That reduction results from the following facts: One million five hundred thousand dollars of it is represented by the discontinuance after December 31, 1918, of all extra pay for qualification in marksmanship; \$12,890,760 is a reduction in the item for the pay of nurses, due to the fact that they will not have in the schools for the training of nurses during the entire year the total number that they estimated would be there and for which they computed the pay. Provision was made in the estimates as submitted for one year's pay for 43,000 nurses, the maximum number required, instead of making it for the average number throughout the year. The House will readily understand—and it is worth bearing in mind, because it has a marked relationship to other items that I will speak of later—that in estimating maintenance—whether in pay or in subsistence or in other things—in order to be accurate a weighted average of the number of people that are to be in the service for the time for which you are providing should be taken, rather than the maximum that may be in the service at any one time in the year. Take, for instance, the case which is at hand. Forty-three thousand nurses might be in the service at the end of July, but manifestly it does not follow that you need to ask and receive pay for 43,000 nurses for 12 months, because at the beginning of July, 1918, the Nurses' Corps consisted of only 12,384, and it will only grow up to the maximum during the course of the year. So that a weighted average of the number of nurses that will probably be in the service has been estimated at 27,692, and it is that number of nurses for which you need to figure pay for 12 months rather than the 43,000 that will repre-

sent the maximum number that will be in the service. It results from this that there has been a reduction, as I have stated, of very nearly \$13,000,000 in this item.

There were various other small miscellaneous items in connection with the pay of the Army that upon an agreement with the Quartermaster Corps resulted in bringing the total reduction up to the amount I have stated of \$18,879,446.80.

Now, in subsistence of the Army there has been a cut of \$108,107,935.50, and the explanation of that cut is found in the following facts: There is a reduction of \$15,870,496.50 largely due to the fact that the Navy now has in its charge the vessels used in the transportation of the Army overseas. The estimate was predicated upon the assumption that the Army would have to subsist the masters, officers, crews, and other employees of transports. Inasmuch as that will be paid for out of the Navy funds, it ought to be and is subtracted from the estimates for subsistence of the Army. Then it was estimated by Gen. Lord that \$91,987,439 would not be drawn from the Treasury during the fiscal year 1919; and inasmuch as this bill is, touching the Quartermaster's estimates, predicated upon furnishing only the moneys that are necessary to meet bills payable during the fiscal year, that agreed reduction could be had.

In addition to that there is a small cut of \$250,000 made from an estimate of \$500,000 submitted for the purpose of using the available land at camps and cantonments for the raising of forage and other crops. There is considerable land that the Government now leases or owns in connection with the various camps and cantonments that it is believed can be used in the production of hay and other crops to the great benefit of the country. The labor for this will come, in a large measure, from conscientious objectors who are in the service and can be put at such work, from German prisoners that may be here, from men in the service who have violated some military order or rule and are subject to punishment for a brief period of time, and from men who are at various camps pending the period when it is determined whether they will or will not be made into soldiers and used as men in the service, who can be employed in such work.

The committee felt, however, as this was more or less a matter that could be abused, that instead of voting \$500,000 for that purpose we would vote \$250,000. We carry a provision in the bill suspending during the fiscal year the law passed by Congress July 16, 1892, prohibiting gardens at Army posts. In years past abuses grew up in connection with gardens that were at posts, and largely in connection with officers' quarters. Congress saw fit to prohibit such gardens. In view of the changed situation and that we now have acres of land running up into the hundreds of thousands that can be cultivated, it was felt that we could afford to suspend the law for the present fiscal year and see what results will follow from the use of the land, some of which is of high character and capable of extensive cultivation.

In the item "Regular supplies, Quartermaster Corps," the department asked for \$69,914,105.34. The hearings have developed the fact that they not only do not need that \$69,000,000, but that they have obtained from the Army act \$108,376,182.81 more than then they need for regular supplies. We therefore eliminate from the estimates that \$69,000,000, and we take as a credit the \$108,000,000 and apply it to the item of clothing, that I will reach later.

That means that the estimates as they were submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, in connection with the estimates that were submitted to the Military Committee and the moneys voted, were in excess of the actual needs in regard to the regular supplies by \$178,290,288.

It may be interesting to the House if I point out some of the items that go to make up this huge difference between what the Army estimated it needed and what it now admits it needs. In the matter of field ranges there was an overestimate of about \$2,000,000. In the matter of repair of heating stoves, \$945,000. In regard to matches, there was an estimate of \$9,000,000. They got from the Army act \$6,691,384. They now revise it to a need of \$2,000,000. So that there is a total saving on that item of \$7,000,000. Of that \$7,000,000 a credit of \$4,691,384 comes from the fund carried in the Army act. The estimate of \$9,000,000 was based on four-fifths of a box for each man a day at three-quarters of a cent a box, which would have made 1,200,000 boxes of matches.

There is a revision in fuel that effects a saving of \$33,008,000. In forage, they estimate a need of \$214,806,648. They actually receive from the Army act \$224,820,760. Their revised estimate on forage is \$103,405,428. So there is thus obtained a credit on the estimates of \$121,415,347.

This was brought about by this fact, which bears upon what I said a while ago touching the weighted averages: The esti-

mate was predicated upon there being in the service some 1,200,000 animals, including horses, for the entire fiscal year. The testimony shows that, due to changes in connection with the number of animals required, the motorization of a good many vehicles formerly estimated to be horse drawn, and the added needs of conserving supplies aboard transports that there will be in the service 827,500 animals. That will be the peak, and the average number of such animals will be 626,000. So instead of providing forage for 1,200,000 animals for the year, what should be provided is forage for 626,000 animals for the year.

This same erroneous calculation runs not only through the matter of forage, but it runs through items of bedding, horse-shoes, transportation of animals, purchase of animals, harness and its parts, and the care of the animals.

A rough calculation indicates that this erroneous basis of computation made \$220,000,000 of excess with reference to animals, their subsistence, transportation, and so forth.

In bedding, the difference is shown in the fact that they estimated a need of \$14,516,832, and their revised estimates show that they need \$3,663,936. They obtained from the Army act \$3,122,424. So that they have now need of a deficiency of \$541,512, in place of \$11,394,408 that they submitted.

In straw for soldiers' bedding they estimated a total requirement for the year of \$13,511,998. Their revised estimates show that they now consider they need \$7,431,589. They obtained from the Army act \$9,139,600, so that instead of there being a deficiency of \$4,382,389, there is an actual credit of \$1,698,011.

In stationery they estimated they needed \$16,687,878, and they obtained that sum from the Army act. They now estimate that they will need about \$10,000,000 for stationery, so that there is a credit of \$6,687,878.

In typewriters they obtained from the Army act \$6,556,651, and they now say they need \$1,280,604, so that there is a credit on typewriters of \$5,275,957.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman care to be interrupted now or would he prefer to proceed until he is through?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I would like to have the gentleman explain to the House why they make a difference of over \$5,000,000 in typewriters in their estimates, if he knows and can give it briefly.

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know that I can explain that particular item now, but most of these errors have come about through taking an arbitrary table of organization and figuring so many of various kinds of materials for a certain organization and then using a multiple and arriving at the total number, which, multiplied by the cost, reaches the total amount asked. Revision of those figures frequently shows the original basis was a basis that had no real facts to stand upon, and reorganizations and rearrangements of the Army result in changes. In these instances about the only answer I can give is that somebody made the estimate who did not have all the facts necessary to make an accurate estimate.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman speaks of revisions. Have those revisions been made by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. SHERLEY. Some of them have and some of them have been done by the Quartermaster Department. I am glad the gentleman has asked that question, because it enables me to say two things that ought to be said in view of the facts that I am developing. One is that fortunately purchases are not being made on the basis of estimates made. In other words, purchases are bearing very much closer relationship to the actual requirements from week to week and month to month than the estimates do. Second, the Quartermaster Department now has at the head of the division of finance, appropriations, and of estimates Gen. Lord. Gen. Lord years ago was the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. He was clerk of that committee at the time, as I recall, that the Dingley bill was reported. He was commissioned an officer in the Army by President McKinley and has brought order out of a good deal of chaos in connection with the quartermaster estimates. It is due to his work and the organization that he has instituted that the committee was able to obtain the information that enabled the cuts to be made. Many of them he brought to the attention of the committee himself, saying that the estimates submitted would not stand analysis, and that upon examination he had determined that reductions ought to be made. Some of them were developed by bringing to the attention of himself and his associates changed factors in connection with the Army program that very largely affected the basis for calculation, and that only illustrates the proposition which I have urged a number of times upon this floor, that it is of the highest importance that there be one central agency in the War Department that shall have the supervision

and preparation of all estimates for all branches of the War Department. At the table of the Committee on Appropriations only comes information touching every angle of the war program, and only there is brought together every angle of the war that enables men somewhat loosely of necessity to see the bearing that one particular estimate or activity of one department may have upon another and how a change in one regard affects very materially changes somewhere else. The illustration I used in regard to animals is a pertinent one. The change there came about for very good reasons. It came about because of the need to conserve tonnage space in transportation. It came about further by the fact that we were going to purchase certain animals abroad, and it came about further by the motorization of many vehicles that were formerly known as horse-drawn vehicles. Those things necessarily affect many, many items and I have mentioned a number here, such as bedding, forage, horseshoes, and things of that kind, and unless there is this broad survey and a constant daily matching up of changes in program in one particular to see how it affects another, there will inevitably follow an inaccurate estimate following such change. But I desire to emphasize again that the purchasing that is being done is not being done upon the basis of estimates submitted, but there is an effort to match the purchases with the weekly and monthly requirements that come from overseas, together with the program for the building up of reserves abroad.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman from Kentucky has given us very interesting information as to how some of these items came to be scaled down into practical figures for appropriations. I think his always characteristic modesty, however, has prevented his suggesting to this committee what some of us know, that a very large, a very serious, and a very important part of the scrutiny of this bill which has resulted in those savings for the Government was performed by the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHERLEY, personally, through long and wearisome labor and application. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. As the gentleman has reviewed the items, it occurred to me that in nearly every item the cut that has been made in the estimate is from 50 to 75 per cent. I was impressed with the idea that a large estimate might be submitted to the committee, with the expectation that it would be reduced to a certain amount. I was wondering if that impression was in any way made upon the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHERLEY. In regard to the War and the Navy Departments I think that is not true. Every now and then we find some small civil service which undertakes to pad an estimate upon the supposition that they are going to get a certain cut, and that thereby they will get what they want. After we find that happens once it rarely happens again in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There has been some pretty good cutting made in the estimates I should say.

Mr. SHERLEY. In regard to incidental expenses, Quartermaster Corps, there is a cut of \$6,498,570.92. Some of that is represented by a reduction of \$102,200 in postage. They admit that the estimate they made for postage and which they had obtained money for was probably excessive to the extent I have indicated. In regard to office furniture, they received from the Army act \$2,883,978, and they estimate now they will need but a million dollars, so there is a credit of \$1,883,978. In the recruiting service they received from the Army act \$280,620, and their needs for the year as figured indicate \$46,770, a saving of \$233,850. In the apprehension of deserters they estimated the requirements for the year of \$2,400,000. They received in the Army act \$1,253,903, and they asked a deficiency of \$1,146,000, which they now abandon as unnecessary, so there is a saving of that sum. In horseshoes the estimated requirement for the year was \$8,129,425. They received in the Army act \$4,736,790, and they asked for the difference between this amount as a deficiency of \$3,392,635, which they now abandon, stating that the amount they received in the Army act would be sufficient.

In transportation of the Army there is a cut of \$835,907,988, and that resulted from the following facts: First, they had an estimate for \$53,430,000 for boats to be built as transports for the Army and as harbor craft of various kinds. We have voted nearly three billion dollars to the Emergency Fleet Corporation for the construction of a great many boats, both transport, cargo carriers, and various subsidiary craft. We appropriated

that money in the past with the understood supposition that it was to take care of Army needs, but whether it be sufficient to take care of Army needs or not it represents a sum of money that practically uses the entire facilities of the country in shipbuilding. Now, if this additional money were to be now voted for construction it would either have to displace to that extent the program now under way by the Shipping Board for the construction of ships, or it would have to await the completion of the program or part of it before it can be spent, and inasmuch as the Shipping Board advises us that they are using the facilities of the country in their program and are building these ships and turning them over for the use of the Army and Navy as fast as it is possible to provide them, we felt there was no necessity for voting \$53,430,000 for a shipbuilding program for the Army Transport Service in order that they might have as a part of their service, with the title in the Army Transport Service, that number of ships. When this war is over we will have one of the great merchant marines of the world, and we will have been using during the prosecution of the war these various ships for the very purposes for which this money was asked. For that reason the committee felt that it would be unjustified in undertaking to vote that amount of money.

Now, in connection with charter hire this situation exists. The Emergency Fleet Corporation charters boats from many sources. It has chartered all of the vessels, sea-going vessels, which were obtainable. Some of them, as the House is aware, have come from our ally, the British Government. Some have been boats owned by citizens of Holland; some have been boats owned by citizens of other countries, and some of them have been boats owned by citizens of America. Some of them are the boats that we took and now own which were interned vessels originally belonging to Germany and Austria. Some are boats we have constructed. As to the vessels we do not own the Emergency Fleet Corporation pays the charter hire necessary for their use. They are then put to the use of the Army, and the Army is charged by the Shipping Board with the charter hire that they have to pay out plus the necessary cost of administration which the Army pays for out of funds appropriated under the item of transportation for the Army. But, in making their estimate for transportation of the Army, they estimate not only for the charter hire of such boats but they estimate for the charter hire of the boats that the Government already owns on the basis of paying to the United States Shipping Corporation for those vessels.

The United States Shipping Board was anxious that that might be done as well as the Army, in order that they might keep their fund as big as their original appropriation and not have it reduced by virtue of the use of these ships, but it occurred to the committee that there was no reason why the Government of the United States should be appropriating moneys to one department to be paid to another department, and there were a great many reasons why it should not, as these things, while they make no difference in actual expenditure, make it very great in the total of appropriations and of moneys that are spent by different departments and makes considerable additional to be paid in connection with bookkeeping and adjustment of accounts. We also believed that inasmuch as the Shipping Board furnished these chartered ships that they had to pay money for that they were in a better position to estimate just what the charter hire for the next fiscal year would amount to than the Army, and we therefore asked them to get in consultation with the Army Transport Service and estimate exactly how much money was necessary for charter hire for vessels, excluding any money for Government-owned ships. They accordingly did so, and as a result of that they revised the estimate from \$342,432,000 to \$153,174,840, or a reduction of \$189,257,160. Similarly, we asked the Shipping Board to figure on the Army estimate for maintenance of the vessels that they would use in the transportation of troops and supplies. The result of revising these figures for maintenance and operation of ships which the Government owns is to reduce the estimate from \$400,890,400 to \$357,588,000, or a reduction of \$43,302,400.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Has the gentleman concluded as to the Shipping Board? I wanted to inquire about section K, on page 4, before the gentleman leaves that subject. That subparagraph, which in giving the additional power to the Shipping Board—

Mr. SHERLEY. I will be glad to discuss that later, but it bears no relationship to this. The items I am speaking of now are not Shipping Board items at all. They are items for the transportation of the Army—for moneys paid to the Shipping Board for expenditures made by it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I only called it up because I thought the gentleman was leaving the subject.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, in addition to what I have enumerated, there were some cuts made in transportation of signal stores. They received out of the Army act \$12,800,400 for the transportation of signal stores. They estimate now for only \$9,000,000, which makes a saving of \$3,800,400. In Engineering stores, similarly, they reduce the money for that by \$849,500. In packing and crating supplies of packages there is a saving on the revision of estimates of \$858,000. The estimate was \$1,980,000, and the amount received in the former act was \$1,122,000, which is now estimated to be sufficient. So there are a number of smaller items in connection with this. For travel allowance to enlisted men on discharge they estimated and received in the Army act \$9,000,000. They say they now need only \$3,000,000, which makes a saving of \$6,000,000. I have already alluded to the fact that in regard to the transportation of animals, due to an estimate upon the number of animals that will not be the property of the Government, and that makes a saving of \$11,400,000. For miscellaneous Quartermaster stores they estimated for the year, \$180,040,000. They now estimate \$115,787,417, which makes the need of a deficiency of \$79,807,417 as against a submitted estimate of deficiency of \$144,060,000, or a saving of \$64,252,583.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Do the estimates the committee considered include the increased use of cavalry in France?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; and as a result of that the estimates in regard to horses, as originally made, on an examination of the program are found to be \$5,948,742 short, and so we increased it by that amount. The estimate on pack animals was about \$46,000,000 too big, so that there is a net saving of \$40,000,000 on animals of all kinds.

For the purchase of harness and parts of harness the needs for the entire year were stated as \$42,859,796. There was given in the Army act \$33,084,770, and a deficiency was requested therefor of \$9,775,026. The revised estimate for the year is \$18,709,057. This results in an abandonment of the deficiency of \$9,775,026 and a saving on the amount heretofore appropriated of \$14,375,713, or a total of \$24,150,739.

For supplies for the care of animals the requirements for the year were fixed at \$15,105,406 and that sum was granted in the Army act. The recent revision reduces that need to \$5,035,150 and a consequent reduction in the amount previously given of \$10,070,256.

Now, in the estimates for the purchase of motor trucks there is a reduction of \$381,597,504, and that is due to the fact that the Quartermaster submitted an estimate for motor trucks for the Engineer Corps, the Signal Corps, the Medical Department, and the Division of Military Aeronautics, and each of these corps had also submitted their estimates. The result was that there was a duplication, which the Quartermaster's Department called to the attention of the committee, and it resulted in the reduction that I have noted.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I understood when abroad that we had something like 60,000 motor trucks over there. Is the gentleman at liberty to state if that number is anywhere near the correct one?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will give in a moment the number of trucks we have provided and have over there. And in that connection I want to say this to the House: It was physically impossible to go into the question of production, except to a limited degree, and I have available here tables touching the Quartermaster's Department as to most of the things they have on hand or, at least, that they have received money for, and which, from a legislative standpoint, presumably exist or the money to get them is available. But the committee did not undertake to go into all the details of production. It would have been physically impossible to have done it, and to have gotten information of value short of two or three months of additional work, and the need of reporting this bill preventing our doing more than undertaking to dig into the financial phase of it, except as incidentally there came out matters touching production. And the hearings will throw a good deal of light on that. I want to say this in connection with the estimates not only for motors but the estimates for motorcycles and bicycles: They are very large, not so large in money, though the money is considerable, but large in numbers. They are so large in numbers that figuring the motorcycles that they have as an initial issue, and for maintenance, and the bicycles, and so forth, it would seem as if 1 man in every 40 could be either mounted on a motorcycle or in a side car in the entire Army of the United States. And

if you include bicycles the number would be considerably less than that. I have stated it very liberally.

The American Army will have overseas, counting those overseas as of July 1, those in factories, depots, and ports, and ordered with 1918 appropriations, 7,216 ambulances, 10,542 bicycles, 12,065 motorcycles, 5,255 motor cars, and 72,379 trucks.

The Quartermaster's Department called our attention to a very great overestimate in connection with gasoline, oils, and lubricants for aeroplanes. They received in the Army act \$70,785,000. Their revised estimate of requirements is \$20,532,973, a saving of \$50,252,027.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman has already shown that he has cut the estimates on horse-drawn vehicles, and so forth, by motorization. I can not understand why the estimate for gasoline should be so decreased also.

Mr. SHERLEY. Gasoline was for aeroplanes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. How does the gentleman account for such a discrepancy between that which the committee found was actually needed and the enormous estimate made by the department?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know. The Quartermaster, Gen. Lord, very frankly said that he did not know how they came to submit such an estimate as \$70,000,000 for the need of gasoline; that that figure had been furnished, as I recall the testimony, to the Quartermaster Department by the Aircraft Division; that their estimate now of what they would need, after an examination into the matter, was \$20,500,000, or a difference of fifty-odd millions that I have spoken of.

Mr. SLOAN. The reduction was 250 per cent of the base.

Mr. SHERLEY. The reduction is what the figures indicate.

In clothing and camp equipment there is an apparent reduction of \$119,564,398, but there is an actual reduction in their estimate of \$11,188,216.35, the difference being accounted for by the \$108,376,182.81 which we picked up from regular supplies, that being an excess that they had under that total and carried over to clothing, as I explained a while ago.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I noticed in the hearings that the committee considered an estimate of \$9,000,000 for matches.

Mr. SHERLEY. We heard it; we did not consider it.

Mr. WALSH. You heard an estimate, and the statement was made that the subsistence could get along with the amount already appropriated. Would the gentleman state what that amount is?

Mr. SHERLEY. I did state it a while ago.

Mr. WALSH. I regret I did not hear it. I was probably at lunch at that time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Two million dollars they now think they need.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have such further time as he desires to complete his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky may have such further time as he desires to complete his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state whether there are shown in the hearings somewhere the amounts appropriated as contrasted with the amounts estimated? Is there such a table?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is shown generally. In the hearings in most instances are tables of revised estimates, and against those are the amounts of money that were appropriated in the Army act, and the differences represent either the deficiencies asked or a surplus which is available for other purposes. In other words, the first column of the table would show the amount of the estimated total requirements for the year. As a credit to that is the amount appropriated. But I am sorry to say there is not in the hearings the original detail of the estimates submitted, although the differences appear as you read and as I have undertaken to explain. But I will say to the gentleman in passing that he will find that it would take quite a bit of time if he undertakes to check up what I have tried to give to the House in a summary which is the result of a great many days' work on the part of myself and the clerk of the committee. I think these figures are all accurate. They have been checked back, and we are prepared to defend the accuracy of them.

When we come to the individual items I shall be glad, if anybody desires, to turn to the basis of calculation and explain why the change was made if the hearings have developed the reasons.

I have already spoken of the fact that in the estimates for horses for cavalry it was found necessary to revise that up by \$5,948,742 over the estimate that they submitted, due to the fact that there were a number of cavalry organizations and other needs for horses that had not been figured in the original estimate.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I understood at one time that they used hardly any cavalry over there, and that later they changed their policy.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think that in a measure is true. Reverting for a moment to the item for Incidental Expenses. The sum of \$54,000,000 is carried there for the expense and tuition of students who, under the new draft law, are to be educated and trained at the various colleges of the country. That includes their expenses other than subsistence, which is carried under the head of subsistence, and as I recall the figures, they estimate that there will be a cost of about \$1.52 a day for these students at the various colleges. Of that sum \$1 per day for 200,000 men for nine months makes the \$54,000,000, and the 52 cents per day is for rations and comes from subsistence. There is a statement, as full as we were able to get it, touching the entire program, which the Members will find in the hearings.

We come now to the item for Hospital Construction. The bed capacity for taking care of troops returning from overseas is figured on 3½ per cent of the total strength that is overseas for a year, or as they usually speak of it, 7 per cent, on the theory that the individual soldier who comes to the hospital will not average over six months' use of a bed, and therefore for the entire year it makes a 3½ per cent provision. This is entirely apart from the hospital and bed capacity that is to be provided and has been provided in America in connection with our troops here, and relates only to what is now spoken of as general hospitals, and is also in addition to such field hospitals as may be abroad. They figure that for an Army of 80 divisions that are to be abroad there should be provision made for 135,000 beds. They have already obtained the money for 20,000 beds, leaving 115,000 beds to be provided for. They estimate that 15,000 of these 115,000 beds will not be established and not be paid for until after the 1st day of July, so that we have carried in this act moneys to furnish 100,000 beds and contract authorization for 15,000 additional beds, which, with the 20,000 already provided for will make their complete total of 135,000 beds. The committee have not wanted in any way to deny any moneys that were needed by the Medical Department in any regard. There have been estimates submitted that if they related to matters other than the care of the sick and wounded might not have met with the acquiescence of the committee, but inasmuch as they did relate to the sick and wounded, we have given in each instance every dollar that they have said they wanted and needed.

There have been some reductions in hospital construction estimates, because they themselves figured a reduction in cost for procurement of some of these beds, and because it developed in the hearing that they had not charged themselves with the \$12,970,000 carried in the Army act and with \$4,460,000 available for hospitals at various Army posts, and at camps that were intended for the use of over-seas troops returning from abroad.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Did not your appropriations provide for the building of the hospitals as well as for their equipment?

Mr. SHERLEY. I assumed that gentlemen were familiar with the fact that in speaking of hospital construction we speak in terms of bed capacity, and when I speak of the money which we are carrying to supply a given number of beds, I mean the hospitals with that bed capacity.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There is a bill now pending before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds asking for a large appropriation to construct hospitals.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suspect that that bill bears relationship to a program looking to the care of soldiers after their discharge from the service, or that it bears relationship to some civilian needs, because the provisions for the hospitals for the Army are not made by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, but are carried as a regular estimate submitted by the Quartermaster General touching hospital construction, and by the Medical Department touching medical and other things needed.

In hospital construction we find an estimate of \$5,500,000 for veterinary hospitals. It is estimated that 15 per cent of the animals that are bought by the Army are not available for service, due to sickness and defects that develop, and that there is a loss of 15 per cent. That does not necessarily mean a loss of

the entire cost of the animal, but it does mean that that animal is not fit for the purpose for which it was obtained. I made a rough estimate that, figuring the number of animals we will have in the service this year and their value, of the number we would buy there would be somewhere about \$17,000,000 worth that would be declared unfit for service. The committee did not feel warranted in spending \$5,500,000 for hospital construction for undertaking to cure \$17,000,000 worth of animals, in view of the fact that there are some facilities existing now and that others could be supplied to the extent needed for less sums of money. The committee therefore reduced that estimate of \$5,500,000 to \$1,000,000, which makes a reduction in hospital construction of \$4,500,000. Then there was an error in estimate of \$3,633,612, a mathematical error, and a reduction that I spoke of in cost of beds of \$2,030,000, which together with the credit from the Army appropriation explains the cut of \$27,613,612.

I have been dealing with the Quartermaster estimates and trying in a very rough way to explain to you the reasons for a cut of \$1,189,674,774.66 made in them. I believe that no cut was made that was not justifiable with the light that was before us, and I repeat that touching pay, subsistence, transportation, there exists under law power in the War Department to incur deficiencies to the extent of the needs so that there can be no harm resulting from that cut. Most of the other cuts are cuts which are acquiesced in by the Quartermaster Department as a result of their own revision and hearings that were developed at the table of the Committee on Appropriations.

The form in which these estimates were finally brought to us was one that is very commendable. It should be followed by a great many other departments, because there was an effort in each instance to show the total requirement for the year, the total stock on hand, the unit cost of the article, the basis on

which the estimate had been made, and then explanatory notes, and it is desirable that similar information be brought here from the other departments.

In the estimates of the Medical Department itself, they submitted a deficiency estimate of \$95,000,000, and we have allowed it all; but I think I should call the attention of the committee to the basis on which the estimate was originally made, and the basis on which it is now revised and made. In submitting their estimates they figured that there would be a total need for the fiscal year in the way of medical supplies and equipment, under the head of medical and hospital department, of \$363,037,531. They obtained through the Army bill \$267,408,948, leaving the deficiency which they estimated, and which as I have stated we allowed. But in making that deficiency it develops that they had obtained from the Army act for 1919 for veterinary supplies \$42,068,000. They now estimate that they will need for veterinary supplies \$4,225,000; so that they overestimated at the time they went before the Military Affairs Committee, and have obtained for the items of veterinary equipment and supplies, an overappropriation of nearly \$38,000,000. They estimated in the Army act that they needed for surgical dressings \$26,416,000, and that amount they got. They now come in and say that they need \$92,988,621 for surgical dressings. In other words, when it develops that their allotment of the moneys that they got from the military appropriation act produced such glaring inconsistencies as \$42,000,000 for veterinary supplies and \$26,000,000 for surgical dressings, they revised their allotments, but without changing the total, and in revising their allotments they figured as I stated for surgical dressings \$92,988,621. I want to read to the committee some of the details of the estimate that goes to make up that \$92,000,000 for surgical dressings. This is the total requirement for 1919:

Surgical dressings.

	Total required through 1919.	Purchased 1917-18.	To be procured.	Cost.	Amount.
Bandages, gauze, composition.....gross..	5,431,200	348,050	5,083,150	\$9.6000	\$48,798,240.00
Bandages, gauze, roller.....boxes..	1,980,552	871,474	1,109,078	11.8000	6,543,590.20
Bandages, plaster of Paris.....dozens..	1,650,460	600,240	1,050,220	1.7500	1,837,885.00
Cotton absorbent, rolls.....pounds..	6,344,688	1,197,692	5,146,996	.4500	2,316,148.20
Cotton babs.....do.....	4,847,080	183,225	4,663,855	.4000	1,864,197.42
First-aid packets.....	17,532,300	7,503,000	10,032,300	.3100	3,110,013.00
First-aid packets, shell wounds.....	17,858,000	1,160,000	16,698,000	.2100	3,505,580.00
Cotton, absorbent.....1-ounce packets..	33,888,500	15,000,000	18,888,500	.0490	925,025.50
Gauze, plain, rolls.....yards..	159,870,000	25,682,545	131,187,455	.0590	6,559,372.75
Gauze, plain, sterilized.....1-yard packets..	11,362,400	1,400,250	9,962,150	.0950	946,404.25
Gauze, sublimated.....do.....	51,598,980	34,030,000	17,568,980	.1000	1,756,898.00
Individual dressing packets.....	33,398,980	10,000,270	23,398,710	.2200	5,147,716.20
Muslin, unbleached.....yards..	2,242,206	371,000	1,871,206	.2000	374,241.20
Plaster, adhesive, 5 yards by 2 1/2 inches.....spools..	11,002,180	1,097,236	9,904,944	.2490	2,377,172.16
Plaster, adhesive, 5 yards by 1 inch.....do.....	21,688,920	1,200,520	20,488,400	.1250	2,561,050.00
Sutures, catgut, chrome.....tubes..	24,518,375	15,769,365	9,749,000	.0600	584,940.00
Sutures, catgut, plain.....do.....	39,223,400	22,941,361	16,282,039	.0900	977,282.34
Sutures, silk, 3 sizes in packets.....	13,492,920	754,758	12,738,162	.0625	796,135.00
Sutures, silkworm gut.....coils..	2,377,332	633,630	1,743,702	1.0000	1,743,702.00
Bandages, rubber, Martin.....	130,685	41,720	88,965	.5800	51,539.70
Bandages, suspensory.....dozens..	129,794	55,396	74,398	1.9000	141,556.20
Splint, Hodgens.....	56,653	36,637	20,016	.8000	17,213.34
Sutures, kangaroo tendon (1 in tube).....	756,350	603,427	152,923	.0800	11,753.94
Sutures, silver wire.....yards..	112,371	86,733	25,638	.1300	3,333.94
Tourniquet and bandage, rubber.....	39,732	28,035	11,717	.7700	9,022.09
Total.....					92,988,621.47

The committee will find in the hearings the tables I have read from, setting it out in detail. The Medical Department stated that they wanted this amount of money, and they stated that some of the estimates might seem excessive, but the committee gave them the amount of money they asked for.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Was any statement made by those who appeared before the committee from the War Department as to what had been done with the bandages and other materials prepared by the women workers all over the country for the Red Cross?

Mr. SHERLEY. Largely they have gone for use in our own hospitals. The amount while it is large and speaks splendidly for the work and activity of the women of America, is relatively small in comparison with the figures I have read.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It struck me that the amount called for would supply the needs of the Army without using any of the material prepared by the women of the Red Cross. I do not understand that their work is for naught, because it has been done in strict conformity with the military requirements.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am sure their work has been of value and has gone to Red Cross hospitals and been used there. Of course, this is true, that there are certain character of wounds, particularly where there is not an immediate healing, where the

quantity of bandages mounts into tremendous figures. The Medical Department seems to think that this amount is large, but they do not feel that they had the right to reduce it. Of course, the committee will understand that the moneys which are voted do not have to be spent in the quantity that is indicated for various substances. They are for medical supplies, and if there is less needed for surgical dressings and more needed for some of the other supplies, they will correspondingly buy more of one and less of the other. I want to repeat again that purchases are not being made simply on the basis of estimates, but I thought it was of interest to the House to see the estimates that were submitted and which as I say, in connection with the Medical Department, have been allowed in their entirety.

For textiles, under hospital supplies, the table shows that they now figure for the entire year an expenditure of \$70,682,673.73. They figure for 6,000,000 blankets, 1,062,899 mattresses, 2,810,840 pillows, 14,319,140 pillowcases, 17,584,200 sheets, 5,808,620 pajama suits, bath and hand towels, 2,534,904, and so on.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman kindly give the figures in relation to the supply of catgut for the surgeon's office? I was wondering whether I misunderstood the gentleman, or whether he gave the correct figures.

Mr. SHERLEY. I read that a moment ago. Catgut tubes 24,518,375 of one kind, and plain, 39,229,400. Then there are silk in three sizes of packages, 13,492,920.

Mr. DENISON. Was the committee furnished any information as to how that amount of money, \$29,000,000 and \$24,000,000, could be expended—

Mr. SHERLEY. That is not money, that is quantity—the number of them.

Mr. DENISON. I thought it was the amount of money the gentleman was giving.

Mr. SHERLEY. No; the money is carried out in a table on the side. The amount of money is very much less. I started out by a statement that I would give the quantity. All the figures I have read of surgical dressings have been figures of quantity, and the total is \$92,000,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. Has any money been appropriated for the purpose of marking the graves of soldiers over the seas, and the transportation of their bodies home?

Mr. SHERLEY. The graves are marked wherever the circumstances make it possible.

Mr. EMERSON. Is anything being done so that bodies can be returned to the United States, supposing the war continues for two or three years?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know as I can answer the gentleman whether anything is being done. The facts submitted show that when the soldier dies abroad, if circumstances permit, his grave is marked. Necessarily and unfortunately many boys give their lives under circumstances which make it impossible to give them a burial in a separately marked grave.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will permit, the gentleman has seen himself on the other side graves marked by a cross and a little label consisting of an American flag and a wreath around a tinfall tablet.

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes; I saw many of them; that is done whenever the surrounding circumstances of the death make it possible.

Mr. SLOAN. As I understand, up to this time there has been no appropriation for the transportation of bodies across the seas.

Mr. SHERLEY. Not for those who die and are buried abroad. There is a provision carried in the sundry civil bill and a provision here for the transportation of the remains of officers and enlisted men.

Mr. EMERSON. I take it that the soldiers are not buried in coffins or caskets.

Mr. SHERLEY. I think in most of the instances where the death occurs it is with such circumstances surrounding it as make it impossible for a burial such as would take place if the soldier died here or back of the line.

In connection with the engineer operations in the field, there was a cut made of \$8,750,000, due to an estimate of 25 seagoing tugs made by the Engineer Department which can and will be furnished by the Emergency Fleet Corporation out of the tugs that it is building. The rest of the estimate was given. Gen. Black, in his testimony, and Mr. Felton very frankly stated that it was impossible to give figures in any true sense of the word for much of what they were estimating for. Touching the amount of railroad equipment, locomotives, cars, rails, ties, and building and appliances in connection with the movement of men and supplies, the estimate was worked out upon the basis of railroad facilities necessary to move a given ton of freight, and as far as one not versed technically in the matter could judge, had been well worked out. I think Mr. Felton, who is a distinguished railroad man, has performed very valuable work, in that he knows pretty accurately what he needs and why he needs it. Touching a great deal of the rest of the estimate of the engineers, it is impossible to come to a conclusion. So much of what happens abroad determines the matter from day to day as to make any estimate more or less a guess, and particularly it is likely as we continue to drive the German Army back and our lines of communication and support are lengthened, that there will be heavier and heavier demands in connection with the Engineer Department.

I might mention a little instance that happened at the front some time ago, which shows the drain which may come at any time upon the supplies of a department like this. There was a certain area in a forest that was very swampy, where it was practically impossible for troops to march through without great delay and struggle, because of the character of the ground. It was necessary, however, that they go through. One of the engineer officers had the initiative, the wisdom practically to make a wire netting, spliced with sapplings and sticks, which was placed upon the underbrush and the dirt and mire of the swamp, which made a roadway over which an American division

marched to one of their very recent victories. [Applause.] He used up a great deal of material, but it was material well spent, and it is because of those things that it is not fair for us to always be a bit sensitive and disturbed over the inability of the department to make accurate estimates. War is itself an agency of destruction, and the prosecution of it means a constant wastage and destruction of property of high value and cost, and we have to have a leeway and have amounts of material and supplies on hand that would not be necessary or tolerated in the prosecution of any peaceful pursuit. So, as I say, we have given the engineers the amount they have asked less the amount for these 25 tugs.

In connection with the Signal Corps we had an exceedingly difficult problem. They have estimated upon the basis of 105 divisions, with an initial equipment of 400 per cent for wastage, and 200 per cent of the 400 per cent for a three months' supply over in France, and a three months' supply in America, or, including the initial equipment, a 700 per cent basis for each division. They estimated on a basis of 105 divisions. They very frankly stated on the record, and informally off it, that it was difficult to say whether that estimate was all required, but that six months had to elapse between the date of an order and the procurement of much of the material; that when it was needed it was very badly needed; that they were buying only as requisitions abroad made it necessary, plus the reserve they must build up, and the committee, considering the whole of it, believed that as the program called for 98 divisions the seven-division equipment was not necessary to appropriate for at this time, in view of the fact that the whole 98 divisions would not have the wastage upon which the tables were predicated, and that there could easily be a safe reduction. We felt warranted in doing that, knowing that the Congress would at any time, as the need might develop, vote additional moneys for this purpose, and we submit what we have done touching the Signal Service as being sound judgment in view of the light given us. In speaking of the Signal Service, the committee will understand that it is now entirely separate and apart from the Aeronautic Service and that this material is material the Signal Corps use in the field in keeping up communications between the bases in the rear and the army at the front, and it is for that class of material.

In connection with the Chemical Warfare Service, the committee also had considerable difficulty in coming to a clear determination. That service has been conducted until very recently from funds that were carried with the Medical Corps funds and with the ordnance funds, and there were allotments made out of the medical fund and the ordnance funds for the maintenance of this Chemical Warfare Service. By Executive order of the President made recently, there was created a separate corps to be known as the Chemical Warfare Service, and Gen. Sibert, who was one of the men to assist Gen. Goethals in building the Panama Canal, was put at the head of that corps. We thought that in view of the fact that this corps had been created as a separate department, it was desirable, instead of having allotments of funds to be made from the Medical and Ordnance Departments, that the funds should be made directly to them. We have accordingly carried in the bill a provision appropriating directly to them the funds they estimate they need. They asked for \$29,484,301. That included the moneys that they thought were necessary for both the defensive and offensive side of this Chemical Warfare Service. Of course, the defensive side, as you all know, is in the way of providing masks and other clothing—protective things—against the gas of the enemy.

The offensive side is in the preparation of shells and other material for firing gas and sending gas over into the enemy's ranks. Their estimates contained a number of items both on the offensive and defensive side looking to experimentation and to the development of new methods of warfare. They were frank in saying that much of this was so new they could not estimate the cost of it, and that a good deal of it represented what they hoped they might be able to do in development. The committee, all things considered, having in mind what they had already gotten out of the previous appropriation, what they were asking represented a sum considerably in excess of what it cost to build the Panama Canal and that the sum was to be expended during this fiscal year, thought that a reduction could be made, and accordingly it was reduced from the estimates by \$44,484,301. I believe that this is not an extreme cut. Considerably more than that is represented under moneys that they may need in the event they make various developments both on the offensive and defensive sides, and we believe that certainly, with four months of the fiscal year gone, that there was not much leeway required in their estimate and that if upon a plain showing moneys were needed they would be promptly voted in the future. In their estimate there are cer-

tain increases in connection with the purchase of the American University property out here—

Mr. SLOAN. Before leaving the matter of gas, will the gentleman state how many gas masks were asked for; that is, if it is a matter of record? I ask this on account of my attention having been called to that particular thing, and I was interested to know in reference to the number of men we had in our Army.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have not available the exact number just now, but the testimony shows it. In money they ask for \$175,000,000 for respirators and \$20,000,000 for more extra canisters. Two and a half millions miscellaneous extra parts for respirators. I think, if the gentleman will turn to page 1160, or a little ahead of that, in the hearings that he will find the statement—I can not just for the moment put my hand on it—as to the initial equipment and maintenance.

Mr. SLOAN. I do not desire the gentleman to spend any time on it. I will look the matter up myself.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course provision is made for every man who goes overseas having a gas mask and a certain amount for maintenance of those who are overseas, and then there is furnished to the men here for training purposes a gas mask each.

Mr. CANNON. There is 17 per cent wastage per month.

Mr. SHERLEY. The granting of a separate appropriation to this service has brought reductions in the estimates of the Ordnance Department, which had been submitted in the belief that they were to continue to furnish funds for the procurement of materials and the labor for filling shells for the Chemical Warfare Service during the remainder of the year. Such reductions were as follows: "Ordnance stores, ammunition," \$6,903,750; "Ordnance stores and supplies," \$3,000,000; and "field-artillery ammunition," \$161,890,589; a total reduction of \$171,794,339.

Mr. DENISON. Is the Government buying this American University property?

Mr. SHERLEY. I was about to speak of that. There is an estimate here looking to the purchase of the American University, and to the expenditure of a considerable amount of money out there. They were to furnish some information for the record touching the exact terms under which they have been occupying the property. At the time they were before the committee nobody seemed to be fully advised as to just what the conditions were. They seemed to have had maybe a written agreement or probably a verbal agreement with the bishop of the Methodist Church, I think it is, who is resident at the American University, touching the use of the property free, and then the right of the university to certain improvements that we were to make there. That was at a time when the activities there were not anything like they are now. They have now in here an estimate touching the purchase of the land, erection of various buildings in connection with the university there. Now, gentlemen, in connection with field artillery—

Mr. SLOAN. If the gentleman will yield right there, in the matter of the purchase of this university, is that purchase or lease or looking toward the continued ownership and control by this Government of that university and all the buildings, grounds, and so forth?

Mr. SHERLEY. There are not many buildings there, at least that the university ever had, but there is some ground there.

Mr. DENISON. There are three or four stone buildings there.

Mr. SHERLEY. There are two large buildings as I recall the testimony, stone buildings.

Touching the ordnance the estimates which were submitted to Congress by the Ordnance Department contemplated the providing of money necessary, in addition to what had previously been voted, for 120 divisions. The testimony of the Chief of Staff showed that the program called for 80 divisions abroad and 18 at home and of necessity the ordnance in estimating has to estimate beyond just the fiscal year due to the very great length of time in procurement, and they have figured that with the replacement of troops which would go to maintain the strength of the 80 abroad and 18 here, there should be provision for 120 divisions. In cross-examination it developed that they were only warranted in estimating for 112 divisions, and when it was suggested that a revision should be made in the estimates to the extent of the difference represented between the additional moneys needed for the total of 112 divisions and the total of 120 divisions, they stated that they had just learned that there had come over from France a new requirement as to artillery and ammunition for each division that would probably more than absorb the leeway which was represented by those additional 8 divisions, it being perfectly evident that the old estimates had been submitted simply on the basis that had been submitted in the first instance for an Army of a million men, and that they had only estimated for their fourth army with some additions.

So the committee suggested to the Ordnance Department

that they take their estimates and rearrange them both as to guns and as to ammunition. They did rearrange them, and they brought back a table based upon an equipment for 112 divisions of the new strength of the artillery per division. That new strength is so much greater than the old program called for that, although the Congress voted moneys that it was believed were necessary for the equipment of 90 divisions of three armies in the previous fortification bills, under the new table of organization that would be sufficient for the equipment of, roughly speaking, about 69 divisions, and so instead of having need for 22 divisions additional on the old program over what they had received they actually had a need on the new program of the difference between 69 divisions and 112, or 43 divisions, roughly speaking.

The result was that they increased their estimates and sent in new estimates for field artillery and the ammunition therefor to the extent of over \$1,155,000,000. Their old estimates were totally inadequate in view of the new requirements as to artillery strength and the ammunition for the guns.

Now, we have in connection with the field artillery proper allowed in contract authorization all that they have asked for except \$114,375,000. We have allowed it because the need of continuing the supply of guns and ammunition is so great that we did not feel warranted in curtailing the amount, though personally I believe that it will require the utmost effort of this country to produce within the time figured the amount that we are providing for here. I question whether it is possible to do it; but in view of the fact that certain parts of it can and will be obtained in even larger measure than was originally provided for, by the help of England and France it is possible that the country may be able to produce the quantities estimated for. We cut, though, as I said, \$114,375,000 out of the field artillery, and we cut that amount out because of the Neville Island project. The Neville Island project was undertaken some time ago, and was originally figured to be an expenditure in plant of about \$40,000,000; and they obtained \$40,000,000 for that purpose in the fortifications act, they having already undertaken it prior to the passage of that act or the submission of the estimate; and they also obtained for similar enlargement at Midvale \$15,000,000. They have transferred \$5,000,000 of the \$15,000,000 that was intended for Midvale to Neville Island, so that they have now for that purpose \$45,000,000. In point of fact, they have given commitments and undertaken work that represents about \$46,000,000. They are asking an additional amount of \$93,000,000 in order to very greatly enlarge this plant and give it a capacity to manufacture 14, 16, and 18 inch guns.

The testimony went to show that deliveries of these 14-inch guns, which they have planned to make there, the capacity of the plant for the 16 and 18 inch guns being intended to take care of future fortifications and Navy needs, was, for the first guns, probably the spring of 1920. Certain shell capacity would be produced in the winter of 1919. If this plant upon its now enlarged scale is to be undertaken, it will probably mean an expenditure of \$29,000,000 for housing of employees in connection with the plant. So that there will be a total expenditure in connection with the plant of probably \$167,000,000.

Mr. DENISON. Does the gentleman think or understand that the Government is going ahead with this program regardless of the outcome of the war?

Mr. SHERLEY. The Government has urged this program upon the committee as desirable in connection with some of its big-gun program relative to the war, and, as an additional reason, the creation of a plant there with such capacity as would enable the Government to supply 16 and 18 inch guns, there being no capacity in America now equal to that purpose.

Mr. DENISON. Now, in that connection, the general talk is, if the gentleman will permit an interruption, that one of the conditions of this peace when it is secured will be the reduction of all military armament to a point where it is simply necessary for preserving peace at home.

Mr. SHERLEY. My answer to that is simply this: This bill is not predicated on what may happen at a peace table. It is predicated on what the war needs from now on may be, and the Subcommittee on Appropriations did not recommend to the full committee an additional expenditure of \$93,000,000 simply because, in its judgment, it did not bear that relationship to the prosecution of this war that would justify the expenditure under all circumstances. And the reason for that was this, that we have now undertaken a program that, in my judgment, is going to test the capacity of the country in steel and other materials, and in labor, in order to turn out the field guns and the ammunition that are necessary.

To superimpose upon that program this additional program of the enlargement of this plant for the purpose of getting guns as far in the future as I have indicated, meant, in my judgment,

necessarily a slowing down of some of the other program to an extent that more than offsets the gain of having a plant at that time capable of producing the guns that this would be able to produce in the spring of 1920, and for that reason we eliminated it.

Now, so far as the "after the war" end of it, which was urged by them, is concerned, I think it is true that we will have need to make big guns for our coast fortifications, and we will have need to make guns for the Navy. It may be possible that the world in its wisdom will come to the point where armament by nations will either be done away with or greatly curtailed, but we have not reached that point yet, and no man that I know is wise enough to prophesy whether we ever will reach it. The probability in my judgment is that if we come to a league of nations there will be, as an incident of that league of nations to keep the peace of the world, a necessary armed force that will belong to the league and will be furnished in proportionate parts by the various nations, somewhat dependent upon their strength and importance in the world. If that should come to pass America will have her part to furnish, and I would not refuse this appropriation, because I thought we were going to do away with guns and ammunition and wars in the future. But the subcommittee has refused to recommend it to the full committee because it did not believe that, taken in connection with the existing program, it represented a wise expenditure at this time, and because we believed it might result more in slowing up than in enhancing the military program.

In that particular we have taken issue with the Chief of Staff and the War Department; the only instance in this bill in which we have taken issue with them. I personally would be very glad if some Member of the House, when we reached that paragraph, if he desires to test the opinion of the House, would offer an amendment to increase by \$114,375,000 the amount that we carry in connection with guns. Then the House can go on record. The committee has no dogmatic view about the matter. It has tried to come to a judgment involving a very difficult thing and involving a very large expenditure of money. If the committee has erred the House can correct that error, and if the House errs the Senate can correct the action of the House.

That is the situation. In cutting out this \$93,000,000 we also cut out certain estimates for guns predicated upon this large plant which amounted to \$21,375,000, making a total of \$114,375,000, and consequently there would go with it the elimination of a large sum of money which the Department of Labor will probably ask in connection with the housing of employees.

With respect to field-artillery ammunition, we insisted that the Ordnance Department should examine its estimates on a basis that would more clearly represent the needs than the rough estimates which they had originally submitted, and that method of estimate was to figure exactly the number of guns that were to be abroad at a given time and to divide the amount of ammunition that would be needed by those guns according to the active and inactive months; and on that calculation, which they agreed was a more scientific and better method of doing it, and on the calculation as to the movement of troops and guns abroad, they have presented their estimates not only for their requirements up to July but after that, and the committee has allowed them in the form of contract authorizations, which are satisfactory to the Ordnance Department, they not desiring cash except in one instance, in which we have given them \$280,000,000 to meet contracts authorized in the last fortifications act which will become payable prior to March 31 in connection with field-artillery ammunition.

There was also an estimate for a nitrate plant, or a series of nitrate plants, amounting to \$103,500,000, but the Ordnance Department did not press it, and stated that they had no desire to undertake the building of those nitrate plants at this time. The condition in regard to nitrates is better than it was some months ago. The supplies on hand of nitrates are greater than they were, and the ammonia nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals is just coming into production, and it is hoped and believed that in a few weeks the production from that source will be very greatly enlarged. There is also a reduction of \$161,890,589 under field-artillery ammunition, due, as I have stated, to giving a separate fund to the Chemical Warfare Service.

We cut out by the voluntary statement of the Ordnance people considerable sums that were carried for the purpose of maintenance of ammunition for this fourth army and for practice ammunition; not that we wanted to slow down—and we do not slow down at all on practice ammunition—but because there will not be this fourth army in the field using this material during the whole fiscal year on the basis on which the original estimate was made. When these items are reached I shall be glad to go further into detail in connection with any of them that the committee may wish.

The committee hearings cover 1,380 pages, and we hope they give to the House as much information as was practicable to obtain and permissible to print. Of necessity there was certain information touching the movement of troops and touching organization that it was not desired should be made a matter of public record. But what could be printed has been, and the estimates in connection with the ordnance, I believe, represent a sum very much in excess of what can possibly be expended. But we felt that we were not warranted in slowing down their movement. They have practically authorized expenditures that wipe out all of the moneys and all of the contract authorizations that have been made heretofore, and it was necessary to give them this additional leeway if we were not to slow down this vastly complicated machinery for the production of these guns and ammunition. We were not willing to take the responsibility of slowing down. This is not a time for the Congress of the United States to slow down in connection with the preparation or the continuation of this war. [Applause.] There is no man in America who wants the Government of the United States to slow down its actual operations in the field or its operations here and elsewhere in supplying that Army in the field. Every man who has a heart wants peace to come again to the world, but every man who has a head wants that peace so to come that it will be a real and a lasting peace. [Applause.] Every sacrifice that has been made has been made in vain unless this war is so prosecuted as to bring about a real peace, a peace that shall come only as a result of a real whipping of our enemies, a peace that comes as a sincere realization on the part of Germany and the nations that have been allied with her that militarism does not pay and that her dream of world rule can not, will not, and shall not come true. [Applause.] It is for that reason that this Government has appropriated in the past sums without parallel. It is for that reason that we have sent the best of our blood abroad to be shed upon the battle fields of France. It is for that reason that we passed the new draft law. It is for that reason that this bill is now pending before this House. It is for that reason that we go forward with the enlargement of plants, with the enlargement of programs; and for my part I am not willing, and I do not believe the Congress is going to be willing by its action to slow by one hour the continuation of this war.

When peace does come, upon terms that make for real, final, lasting peace, a peace of justice and of righteousness, we as a peace-loving Nation will welcome it and rejoice in it; but we will not endanger it by halting in the ways half won. We will not endanger it by slowing our activities now. We will not endanger it by any deceptive pleas that may be made by the enemy because they are beginning to feel the force of the righteous indignation and might of the world. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, there is much in connection with this bill that ought to be stated, and yet I have now talked for some two hours, and I am feeling the fatigue of the work so much that I believe I can not perhaps with profit to the committee deal further with the matter in a general statement. The responsibility of preparing a bill of this kind is very great. In order that we may prosecute the war as I have expressed the belief that we should prosecute it, we must carefully husband our resources. We must see to it that expenditures are not made unnecessarily. Every dollar expended by the Government or by the citizens of America for purposes not necessary is just that much slowing down of the war program; and therefore the man best helps that program who tries to vote moneys intelligently for needs that are real, and prevents money being wasted, and—what is even more important—material and labor being wasted in the creation of things that are not necessary. Therefore it has been that the committee has worked day and night to try and sift much of these estimates, so as to eliminate some of the things that were not necessary and that the zeal or the ignorance of individual men had occasioned to be brought before the Congress.

The estimates submitted by the Navy Department for maintenance and operation of that department and for the Naval Establishment aggregated \$125,064,601.26. The amount carried in the bill for the naval service is \$107,217,778.26, a reduction under the estimates of \$17,846,823. The largest single reduction is the sum of \$14,891,000 in the item of ammunition for vessels, and represents practice ammunition which, in the judgment of Admiral Earle, safely could be eliminated. The sums of \$1,793,000 for improvements at ordnance stations and \$165,000 for fuel storage at Pearl Harbor were omitted on the statement that their consideration might be postponed until the regular naval bill for 1920.

The amount given the Navy is composed chiefly of four items in addition to the item of ammunition just mentioned. Fifteen million dollars is recommended for outfits on first enlist-

ment, \$11,185,301 for ordnance and ordnance stores, \$26,529,464 for new batteries for ships of the Navy, and \$2,856,080.61 for construction and equipment of training camps. The latter sum is a deficiency actually incurred and obligated without previous authorization of Congress, and there remains only the function of paying the bill.

There were submitted also in connection with this bill estimates from the various departments here in Washington for over \$3,000,000 in salaries and increases in pay for clerks, and not a dollar of it has been recommended by the committee. [Applause.] It has not been recommended because we did not believe it was desirable in the interest of the prosecution of this war to add to the clerks that are here in Washington. The remedy for a shortage of clerks in any department is a readjustment of the allotment of clerks to the various departments. [Applause.] There are some departments that are short. There are a great many departments that have clerks who are in the way of one another, and, I repeat, the remedy is a rearrangement of those clerks. We have carried moneys here to take care of existing pay rolls. In some instances those pay rolls represent perhaps more than what they should; but we have denied requests for increases of clerks here, and particularly at this time we think that action is wise and justifiable.

We have also eliminated a great deal in the way of odds and ends that would be desirable in peace times, but are not desirable now. The Government of the United States is asking every day, and it is going to continue if this war goes on to ask more and more of the citizenship of America that they forego the doing of things that would be desirable in peace times, but that are not permissible now. We have stopped much of the building of the country by private interests. We ought to see to it that we do not do any building of our own that is unnecessary; and civil departments of the Government, instead of using the war as an excuse for asking additional moneys, ought to realize that they can best show their patriotism by curtailing their activities during these times. [Applause.] For my part I have reached the point where it is going to require a good deal of showing to warrant the undertaking of civil activities in the future, and I think it would be well if before an estimate is permitted to come to Congress there should be received from the War Industries Board a clearance for the material and the labor necessary to carry out the project that is asked. Unless these things are to be done we are going to have confusion worse confounded as the strain goes on and on.

This bill carries an affirmative proposal which I drafted and the committee were good enough to accept. It is a proposal for the creation of a salvage commission to study the problem of the disposition of war material after the war. A good many bills have been introduced in this body and in the Senate dealing with this subject. My friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon], a member of the committee, introduced one bill which looked to the creation of a commission with power to dispose of governmental property.

The proposal that I have carried in this bill is built on a different line. It is a proposal for the creation of a commission that shall have no power except that of recommendation at this time. Personally I believe that Congress would not and should not give to any commission the power to dispose of Governmental property at this time or after the war until we have had some opportunity for an inventory of such property and a consideration of its uses. So the provision is written in simple language, with broad power of inquiry and of report, but with no power of final action. The President is authorized to appoint seven Members whose duty it shall be to make a survey of the property of the United States and particularly that acquired since the beginning of the war, and in order that they may better perform their functions it is made the duty of the various departments to make an inquiry and study of the property under their control, and what use can be made of that property or other Government property, and the departments or agents of the Government are required to furnish to the commission such information as the commission may from time to time require. The commission is to report to Congress at the first and each subsequent session of the next Congress, and is required to furnish to the President or to the Congress any other information that may be asked from time to time.

The idea is simply this, that we may get a body of men put to the task of surveying this vast accumulation of property. No matter whether the war ends in the immediate future or next year or two years from now there is bound to be a tremendous amount of property of great value if it is put to a right use, but which will be worthless beyond its value as junk unless there is a provision, study, and understanding of uses to which it can be put. England has for a number of years had a number of commissions engaged in this study and so have the other

nations at war. It is time we were taking some thought of those days that are to follow after the war; take thought of it, not with the idea of slowing the war activities but coincident with them, giving study to it, and, indeed, much of the study ought to have been at the time the investments were made in connection with the war in order that there might be provision made looking to the subsequent phase of the peace use of this property. Some departments have done that. I think the engineer department of the Army for one, in regard to terminal facilities, railways, and equipments had in mind the subsequent possible need, and in some instances have had contracts incident to the creation of facilities looking to their taking over by private interests.

But, anyway, we need this study. This is presented not as a final word on the subject, but as a method to an end. I believe that no one of us is wise enough now to write into rigid law just what power and duties shall pertain to any agency of the Government touching this property. I do not want to see any rigid law passed now touching the disposition of this property. I want a survey first as the basis of action afterwards. If men of the right caliber—and they ought to be big men, very big men; not necessarily men of great wealth, but big men in the true sense of bigness, whose vision reaches beyond the horizon and who would not permit things immediately in front of them to blot out that vision—are chosen, if we get a commission of that kind, we will get from them information that will be of value to the country, and I trust that this provision may prevail in the Committee of the Whole.

As I stated, when we come to the details of the bill I will be glad to call the attention to many items contained in it.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. SLOAN. As the gentleman knows, we have had no opportunity to read the bill, as it has just been reported, and it prompts Members to ask more questions than perhaps they otherwise would. I am pleased with the admirable statement made by the chairman of the committee and impressed with its force, and impressed with the work that has been done in connection with the prominent features of the bill just mentioned. I would like to ask if the committee in the bill has done anything toward organizing or providing for a committee with power to look over or look after the economies in the expenditures of these vast sums through the various departments during the period of the war?

Mr. SHERLEY. The committee has made no recommendation. As the gentleman knows, I have been one of the men who have believed for many years past that the Congress and the Government in its internal organization represented what in many ways was an archaic system. I still think it. I believe that we ought to have an independent audit that should be responsible to the Congress of the United States and not to the administrative body. We ought to have that irrespective of war or peace. I believe that the organization of committees in this House ought fundamentally and radically to be changed. This House will never have that voice in matters of first moment that it should have unless it ceases to waste its time in the consideration of little details. [Applause.] If we undertake always to curtail departmental activities simply by division and subdivision of items, we will simply spend in the future, as we so frequently have in the past, our time in debating matters that are relatively trivial. We frequently accomplish only the result of tying the hands of the conscientious and efficient administrator and give to the efficient one a new reason for exercising his ingenuity to avoid complying with the will of Congress.

We must have a system of bookkeeping that will give to an auditing organization knowledge of expenditures, and then we can hold rigidly accountable those who are responsible for extravagant expenditures.

Why do I not propose something of that kind now? First, because I have not the time—and those who know something of the labors of the committee can appreciate that that is a true statement—to work out a program that would be efficient, even if I had the ability; second, because you can not do it now in war times. I know that does not meet the concurrence of a great many men, but believe me when I say to you that the situation touching all the Governments at war is more or less the same.

The great contribution that Gladstone made to the parliamentary procedure when he brought about the reformation in the English Parliament was in the creation of an independent audit. But if anybody thinks that over in England to-day Parliament is undertaking to know and pass upon the expenditures that are being made by the British Government they are mistaken. Parliament can not do it in a time of war. The

Admiralty comes to the ministry and says, "We want so many million pounds." The ministry says, "We think you ought not to have it. The condition is such that we do not feel like making that expenditure." "All right," says the Admiralty, "we say it is necessary in order that the fleet shall continue to do certain things. You take the responsibility, if you want to, of denying to the fleet the necessary money." And no ministry ever does that or ever will do it. The same is necessarily true of other countries. War is a game in which time is of the most importance, and you can not undertake to determine expenditures in the same way that you can in time of peace. That does not mean that there are not plenty of improvements that can be made in connection with the prosecution of the war. It does not mean that there are not plenty that have been made. I have stood here for some time talking about the estimates that came from the Quartermaster's Department. I would give a totally false picture if I did not again emphasize the fact that I believe Gen. Lord has brought into that organization now a method of estimate and procurement that will eliminate most of these erroneous, and in some instances absurd, estimates of the past, and it was because he has the matter in hand that my colleagues and I were able to dig out this information and present it to the House. If there had been nothing but confusion up there, we could have found some of it, but no committee operating simply through the process of examination of witnesses could have dug out this information to present to this Committee of the Whole if it had not been that there had already come into the conduct of estimate and procurement of the Quartermaster's Department order out of a great deal of disorder. The same thing is happening in a number of other departments.

I do not hold a brief for Army or Navy officers, and I do not hold a brief for administrative officers generally. The very position I hold makes me more or less the critic of administrative officers. A man fit to be chairman of the Committee on Appropriations must occupy the attitude of the critic more or less of the administrative departments, and yet there is a great deal of criticism of individual men that is born of the ignorance of the problem those men are confronted with. It is usually the man who knows least about the difficulty of the problem who is most apt to be dogmatic about it, and to be dead sure as to how the thing should be remedied and just what he would be able to do if he had charge of the work. Take a matter like the estimate I spoke of for the Signal Corps, and suppose that upon you rests the responsibility now for having equipment in hand from time to time to go overseas, in order that the intelligence may be maintained between the men at the front and the men behind at either advance headquarters or general headquarters. The war shifts from day to day. There is a battle line that runs for a hundred or more miles, with every modern method of communication in vogue, and you have to plan for six weeks, six months, or a year ahead. You will not be upon that work many days before you will lose your dogmatism and get humble in the face of the difficulties of the problem.

Mistakes have been made, and they will continue to be made, but it has been a very wonderful achievement that this country has produced in the prosecution of this war. [Applause.] The time will come when we who are now actors upon the scene have passed away, when men will look from a sufficient distance to get some view of the whole scene, when it will be called the marvel of the world that a Nation should have put across the water in the time that we have done it the troops we have, equipped as they have been, fed as they have been, trained as they have been, and with the glorious courage and bravery and heroism that they have exhibited, whenever called into action. [Applause.]

I stand here before the committee to bring out the things that I think are wrong, because that is my duty, and I owe a duty to the House and to the country that is beyond any duty that may belong to a party, but I do not bring these things out, bad as some of them may be, and corrected as they should and will be, with the idea of belittling the achievements that have taken place upon the part of the people of America under the leadership of the President of the United States. It has been a glorious achievement. Its fruits are being seen every hour. News can not travel fast enough to carry the happenings of each moment that serve to add additional glory and luster to America and American soldiers and sailors. There were dark days in March, in April, in May, and in June even. Nobody can know who has not talked with some who were there how dark the days were in the spring and early summer in France. It was America that saved the civilization of the world, and she saved it within almost an hour of time. She saved it because there had been enough organization and enough work and enough preparation back here to make it possible to have

there at that crucial hour the men who were there wearing the uniform of the United States prepared to give their splendid youth in order that civilization might not die. [Applause.] No one need apologize for the achievements of America in this war. No one need go out to the people anywhere and say to them that things have gone wrong and are awry. They are not. They are going forward, and every day is an advance, every day is an improvement. If I point out to you the things that are wrong it shows not that we are failing, but to the thoughtful, thinking man it shows the magnitude of the task that we have undertaken, and the wonder is not that mistakes have been made, but the wonder is that a people should suddenly turn from peaceful pursuits overnight and become the most formidable, powerful, military nation in the world, and that we are to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, after the lengthy and exceedingly able explanation of this large deficiency appropriation bill by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. SHERLEY] I do not desire to take up much of the time of the committee. All that he has said about the labor connected with the preparation of the bill is true, and the half has not been told. While he sits on one side of the aisle and I sit on the other I feel that I would not perform my duty to the House and to the country if I did not say that under his leadership and the cooperation of all his colleagues in the preparation of the bill there has been but one motive in the committee, composed as it is of Members from different party organizations, and that is to present a bill under the operation of which, supplementing appropriations that have been made, peace will be brought to this country and to our allies. [Applause.] There has been no question of partisanship in the consideration of the bill. There has been no desire upon the part of any member of the committee other than to recommend all that is necessary to be given at this time for the successful prosecution of the war. There were many things to consider in the preparation of the bill. Gentlemen should stop to think a minute of what confronted us—the money that has been gathered by taxation up to this time, the money that is to be gathered by taxation under the pending revenue bill, the large amount used in financing our allies, the calling into existence and training of our Army and the furnishing it with arms, the building of ships to transport our products and Army, the building of destroyers, the construction of a larger and I might say a new Navy, and it is because of these things that we have been called upon to make these extraordinary appropriations and expenditures.

And I take pleasure here and now in saying that during my service of over 40 years in the National House of Representatives, so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, it has never had a chairman to lead it and to inform the House superior to the one it has to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we did not become a participant in this world war until Germany, while we were exercising our rights as a neutral, destroyed our ships on the high seas—the world's great highways.

Then we declared war. Since that time our people of both great parties have been a unit, cooperating with our allies to win the war and secure a victory that will prevent Germany from dominating the world.

Until victory is had questions of peace policies to be determined by majorities can not arise for the United States. In our country we are all for a successful winning of the war, whether we call ourselves Republicans, Democrats, or Independents. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes of my time to my colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, Representative MONDELL.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I feel like apologizing to the committee for taking even a brief time in the discussion of this bill after the very clear, lucid, informing, eminently fair, and accurate statement that has been made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. As one member of the minority, and expressing, I believe, the view of the entire minority of the committee, I can say that we approve the view and the attitude expressed by the gentleman from Kentucky touching this bill and indorse his statement of the views and policies that were adopted and carried out by the committee in the formulation of the bill. Personally I came into the preparation of this bill rather late in the game. I am not a member of the subcommittee having it originally in charge, but owing to illness in the families of other members, after hearings were well along I was asked to assist somewhat in the hearings and in the final preparation of the bill. So I speak, therefore, from the standpoint of one who has not as full and complete information with regard to the items of the bill as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], who gave very much time and attention to the bill

from the very beginning. I want at the outset to express my appreciation of the work of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] in connection with this bill. He is an exceedingly modest man, and he gave in his statement much credit to others for the work of the committee which resulted in the very great reduction in the appropriations below the estimates, with the complete acquiescence of the representatives of the departments; but the fact is that all of this was very largely due to the work of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], who brought his keen, analytical mind, his wide knowledge, and his mature judgment to bear in the investigation of all the questions that came before the committee in the preparation of the bill. [Applause.] He was very ably aided and assisted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has had knowledge of these matters time out of mind, and to whom the problems that are presented in connection with the consideration of an appropriation or a deficiency bill are very familiar.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE], with his wide business experience and his keen mind, was exceedingly useful and helpful in the preparation of the bill, as were the majority members, Messrs. BYRNS of Tennessee, Sisson, and EAGAN, all of whom gave a great deal of time and very close attention to the hearings and rendered valuable aid in the final make-up of the legislation. I desire in the few moments I shall consume to emphasize a few points touched on by the gentleman from Kentucky. In these days of war and when our victorious troops and those of our allies are constantly pressing the enemy backward all along that shifting, bloody battle line in France it is tremendously important that nowhere, either at home or abroad, shall there be anything said or done to create the impression that we are letting up in the least in the force, volume, or efficiency of our military preparations. One viewing the very great reductions made in the bill below the estimates, reductions amounting to \$2,540,375,985, might receive the impression that the mind of the committee had to a degree been affected in arriving at its decisions by recent suggestions of a possible early peace. I want to emphasize the declaration of the gentleman from Kentucky that the committee passed upon these items as though there had been no talk of peace, and with the view that there could be no peace except the peace of absolute and conclusive victory. All the reductions in the estimates, save possibly the reduction in the Neville Island estimate and a very few others of a minor character, were made with the full acquiescence of the heads of the departments making the estimates. The members of the committee did not feel that they would be justified in asserting that it would be fair to the House for them to assert their own judgment against the final and conclusive judgment, after full consideration and discussion, of the men who are responsible for the estimates and for the expenditure of the moneys that are appropriated. The gentleman from Kentucky has called attention to the very marked and extraordinary reductions that were made below the estimates in a very considerable number of items, particularly those of certain branches of the War Department, and the gentleman has been good enough to absolve from the responsibility that one might reasonably insist rested upon the men making those estimates, a portion at least of that responsibility, by giving reasons or excuses for estimates made largely in excess of the sum finally determined to be necessary. I grant you it is true that in making up estimates hurriedly, making up estimates having to do with troops in the field engaged in war operations on an unprecedented scale, those who are responsible for making up those estimates should not be expected to trim them too closely.

It is their duty to estimate liberally. And yet, after all is said in excuse and extenuation, it does seem a little extraordinary that after several guesses the War Department should conclude it needed not \$11,000,000 for matches, but \$2,000,000. It does seem extraordinary that, after having twice estimated in the matter of veterinary supplies, the department should not have known that it needed only about \$4,000,000 for these purposes and not \$40,000,000. It does seem extraordinary and difficult to explain that the officials of the department should have overestimated, not once, but twice, their needs for forage for animals to the extent of \$121,000,000. And it does seem extraordinary and almost beyond comprehension that men whose duty it was to know the needs of the service should have had so little information with regard to the necessities of the air service as to have estimated \$70,000,000 for gasoline for airplanes and then have concluded that they only needed \$20,000,000. I mention a few out of many glaring and very extraordinary evidences of either gross carelessness and indifference or very loose methods of calculation.

I hope it is true that we now have an organization in the War Department under which we shall not in the future have these extraordinary and grotesque estimates. I think, how-

ever, it is well to recall and remember the fact that if it were not for the labors of a committee of this House in the careful consideration of estimates this bill would have carried two and a half billion dollars more than it does carry, a sum sufficient to conduct the entire Government for two years prior to the war. It may be said thoughtlessly that even though the additional sums were appropriated no particular harm would be done, because they would not be expended. That is not a true or accurate statement of the situation; for while it is probably true that the War Department has not been contracting as wildly as it has estimated, it is true that the War Department or any other department, or any other aggregation of men anywhere, are to a certain extent governed in their expenditures by the money at their command and disposal.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment.

And in these times it is not only the question of the useless expenditure of the public money; it is the question of the expenditure of the public money for purposes and uses that are unnecessary, resulting in the checking of enterprises that are essential to the winning of the war. The Nation is strained to the utmost to carry out the enormous military program provided for in this and former bills, and not a dollar and not a unit of man power should be diverted from the carrying out of the necessary and essential program.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This bill is purely a military bill and providing for war necessities. I see there is an appropriation of over \$16,000,000 here for civil services. Would not that more properly come under a civil deficiency bill?

Mr. MONDELL. This is a general deficiency bill that includes deficiencies from all of the departments. The major part of the bill, the bulk of it, relates clearly and definitely to the Military Establishment. Of course there are some deficiencies in the other establishments of the Government, most of which, however, have some relation to the war.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. How does the Civil Service department connect this activity with the War Department?

Mr. MONDELL. The Civil Service Commission, if that is one of the items the gentleman has in mind, requires additional help above what was appropriated for, necessary for the holding of civil-service examinations of war workers throughout the country.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. I note the gentleman's suggestion that there might be about the same flexibility and elasticity of expenditures in the War Department as there was in estimates. If that is true, or measurably true, would it not be wise policy to have a supervising or auditing committee to look after that expenditure?

Mr. MONDELL. Well, I think it might be very well to do that, but up to this time the administration has not been in favor of such an audit, and the Congress has followed the view of the administration in that matter.

Mr. Chairman, how much of my time has expired?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, for just a moment I want to discuss the Neville Island project, and before I go to it I want to say this, that being called in rather late in the hearings on the bill I had considerable difficulty in making up my mind with regard to a number of items. Eventually there was complete agreement among the members of the committee, so that the bill as reported represents a unanimous decision. One of the very considerable items that we had to pass upon was that of a \$93,000,000 increase in the plant at Neville Island, upon the top of which would be another item of \$29,000,000 for housing. As I said a moment ago, that was the only item not appropriated for in favor of which there was insistence upon the part of the War Department. But let it be understood that that insistence upon the part of the War Department relative to Neville Island was not an insistence based wholly or principally upon war needs. It was an insistence upon the plant as a great gun-making concern, as Gen. March said, for all time, and without regard to the present emergency. The funds available, amounting to \$45,000,000, will build a plant capable of manufacturing guns up to 18-inch, although the capacity was predicated on 14-inch guns. But a part of its productive capacity will be for 16 and 18 inch guns, even though we do not increase the capacity of the plant. So that, with the \$45,000,000 now available we will have facilities for large guns of all classes and calibers up to the largest gun now made or proposed by anyone. To at this time add to that plant \$93,000,000 of expenditure, and later on top of that \$29,000,000 of

expenditure for housing, was to strain to the breaking point the productive capacity of the country in steel, and in other materials of various kinds, and in man power.

At this time, when the War Industries Board is refusing authority to erect buildings and plants all over the country, when we are curtailing construction everywhere, it did not appear to the committee we were justified in going on with this great work, which under no circumstances can produce guns until well into the year 1920, and which can produce guns just as quickly but not as many of them with the smaller as under the larger program. Furthermore the Congress has never affirmatively given its assent to this great gun enterprise. We did appropriate in the fortification bill \$40,000,000 for the original scheme, because the work was under way; but other than that the Congress has never authorized this great construction. The committee was therefore not only called upon to determine as to whether we should recommend \$93,000,000 more for this plant, but whether the committee should take the responsibility on behalf of the House of now accepting as settled and determined upon the construction of the greatest gun plant in the world. If that were done the \$29,000,000 housing plan would, of course, follow. If it seems wise to enlarge this plant later on, that can be done then at a very much less expense than at this time.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes, briefly.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to ask the gentleman if one of the peace terms proposed by the President, which he said was essential, was not the reduction by international agreement of all military armament to the point necessary for domestic peace only?

Mr. MONDELL. That is true.

Mr. DENISON. Now, then, if we are going to insist upon that as a peace term, and Germany has agreed to it, are we not a little bit inconsistent in going ahead and making preparation here at home at the same time for a plant of that kind which will be of no benefit to us in this war?

Mr. MONDELL. I believe we would be very inconsistent if we adopted at this time the larger program. As to whether we are inconsistent in going on with the present program I am not prepared to say. Contracts are made and the work is under way, and that plant will produce some ammunition early in 1920, and some guns a little later in 1920, and it will be a great plant at that.

Mr. DENISON. I would not, of course, question anything that may be necessary to aid us to complete this war, but I am talking about the construction of this great plant for the future when we are at the same time saying to Germany, and presumably our allies agree with us in that, that one of the points we are going to insist on in the final peace arrangement is the disarmament of all nations by international agreement down to the point where it is necessary only to preserve domestic peace.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, we all hope that much of that may be accomplished, although as one of the individuals who has dreamed dreams of world-wide peace more or less for a long time I am not so certain in regard to it now, I regret to say, as I once was. I am afraid we will always have to make some guns and probably some very big ones [applause], and we ought to have some preparation for making such guns. The committee declined to approve this larger program, as was clearly indicated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], purely on the ground that it would not, in our opinion, furnish material for this war unless the war should last longer than anyone estimates, and the meantime the carrying on of the enlarged program would shorten and interfere with the necessary and essential present program in the manufacture and production of those things that we must have.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to me, in view of the statement that the gentleman has made in regard to this large appropriation, which was not approved, or this large estimate, that it is not a deficiency matter at all. The gentleman seemed to think that they might properly have put it in their bill if they had thought best. Does that mean that this bill, called a deficiency bill, provides for a large number of new projects and propositions and therefore is not really a deficiency bill?

Mr. MONDELL. This bill provides only for war necessities, and the statement the gentleman has made in a way emphasizes the wisdom of the committee in not approving the estimate for this enlargement at Neville Island.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If it is strictly a deficiency bill, is it not to make up some shortage, something that should have been appropriated in larger amounts before?

Mr. MONDELL. The argument might be made that this plant having been started without any definite limit of cost, there was a deficiency, because they did not have money enough available to build it as large as the War Department thought best. At any rate, the item is out of the bill for the present, and I hope it will not be placed in the bill by the House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the presentation of this bill by a committee united as to all of its items again emphasizes the unity of the American people and the Congress of the United States behind the President of the United States and his administration in the prosecution of this war to a final and conclusive victory. [Applause.]

This bill is brought in on the theory that we do not propose in the slightest degree to let up in our preparation for the continuation of the conflict until we have been victorious all along the line; that it is the will and judgment of the American people, as represented in this House, that there shall be no parley, that there shall be no armistice, that will give the enemy an opportunity to withdraw in force behind stronger lines in order that in a future day he may confront us with all of his forces augmented and defiant. It is presented on the theory that the western battle front, that fateful battle line on which hangs the hope of freedom and ordered liberty, shall continue to be a fighting line provided with every needed facility in abundance until we have driven the enemy back to his own territory, captured or destroyed his armies, and brought him to unconditional surrender. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by incorporating a resolution dealing with the reconstruction problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating a resolution dealing with reconstruction work. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, is this a resolution that is pending before the House?

Mr. LONDON. A very brief resolution that I introduced some two weeks ago.

Mr. WALSH. There is no need of printing in the RECORD resolutions that are introduced. That is not customary. The resolution is printed in resolution form. I shall object to printing it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE MEEKER.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I rise to announce the death of our colleague, Hon. JACOB EDWIN MEEKER, of Missouri, who died early this morning at St. Louis. At some future time I shall ask the House to set aside a day upon which his colleagues may address the House upon his life and character. I now offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 445.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JACOB EDWIN MEEKER, a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That a committee of 20 Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions, and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker announced as the committee on the part of the House Mr. RUCKER, Mr. SHACKLEFORD, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BORLAND, Mr. BOOHER, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. HAMLIN, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. RUBEY, Mr. HENSLEY, Mr. IGOE, Mr. DECKER, Mr. ROMJUE, Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. DYER, Mr. RODENBERG, Mr. KNUTSON, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PURNELL, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect this House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, October 17, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 13087) providing for the taxation of articles of commerce in the production of which child labor is employed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONDON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 55) defining the meaning of victory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 13088) granting an increase of pension to Augustus G. Weissert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 13089) granting an increase of pension to William McFarlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 13090) granting a pension to Julia M. Little; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13091) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 13092) granting a pension to Margaret E. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 13093) granting a pension to Samuel R. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 13094) granting a pension to Annie Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Catholic Young Men's Literary Society, protesting against the zone system as applied to periodical postage rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of George W. Ashley and certain other farmers of Lodi, San Joaquin County, Cal., against extending the time for setting the clock ahead one hour beyond October 27, and stating reasons therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Petition of citizens of Tennessee urging better care of our soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Philadelphia Bourse, protesting against any change in the present daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 17, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray Thee to write Thy law upon our hearts and in our minds. Do Thou place in us Thine own thought, Thine own will, that we may render Thee loving obedience, that we may be glad to do Thy will. Let Thy loving favor rest upon us this day. Grant, we pray, that we may see and feel the onward spirit of the mighty God of righteousness and of truth, and that we may feel the inspiration of having a part with God in the establishment of the high ideals of a Christian civilization in the earth. We pray Thee to stay the ravages of this dread disease that has spread itself over all our land. Hasten the day, we pray Thee, for deliverance by the care and confidence of those who put their trust in Thee, that there may be an end of the disease, and out of it we may have learned that obedience and that trust which make us perfect. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., October 17, 1918.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN HOLLIS BANKHEAD, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BANKHEAD thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Monday last, when, on request of Mr. KENYON and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

DISASTER AT MORGAN MUNITION PLANT.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, out of order I offer a resolution and ask that it be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 317) was read, as follows:

Whereas the recent disaster at the Morgan munitions plant, near Perth Amboy, N. J., October 4 and 5, resulted in the loss of scores of lives, the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property belonging to the United States and to private owners, and the rendering homeless of thousands of citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate be, and it is hereby, instructed to make an inquiry into the causes which brought about said catastrophe, whether by accident or work of alien enemies or agents thereof; what precautions had been taken to prevent such an accident; what plans have been adopted, if any, with a view to the rebuilding of the plant upon a safer basis; what measures have been determined upon, if any, toward the protection of similar munition plants elsewhere.

Resolved further, That said Committee on Military Affairs be authorized and directed to subpoena witnesses and compel their attendance, to send for persons and papers, and to do such further acts as may be necessary to secure any and all information desired in the furtherance of this inquiry, and that a report of the finding of such committee shall, upon its conclusion, be made to the Senate not later than December 6, 1918.

Resolved further, That the sum of \$5,000 be appropriated from the contingent fund of the Senate to cover the expenses incident to this inquiry.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I simply wish to state that while under the rules the resolution will have to go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but such a very serious situation exists in the area around these munitions plants at the present time that no delay should exist in passing this resolution. The explosion killed over 150 people and damaged property within an area of 50 or 60 miles. It rendered homeless about 10,000 people, who for several days were refugees along the road. The explosion continued for about two days. Seventy-five hundred pounds of trinitroethylol were blown up. Before the explosion the mayor of New York City ordered the subways closed, fearful of the result. The effect of the explosion was seen in New York City, nearly 40 miles away.

At the present time there are several other magazines at this plant containing 150,000 pounds and one containing 600,000 pounds of trinitroethylol. Should an accident occur with the existing amount of explosives, it would not only mean the destruction of property within an area of 50 miles but within an area of 100 miles, and undoubtedly would seriously affect New York City as well.

The people there are in a state of terror. They are living outside of their homes. Two or three days ago there were 60 bodies in the morgue unburied because they had not coffins and the facilities for burying them. The situation at the present time should be investigated, and if this large amount of explosives is not properly safeguarded, if it is not properly distributed, and should another explosion occur, it would mean more destruction of life and property.

The object of the resolution is simply to have the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs make an inquiry to ascertain what the War Department is going to do. The Gillespie Co., who are running this plant, seem to ignore the fear and the protest of the people in that locality.

I hope the Committee on Contingent Expenses will make a prompt report in order that the resolution may go to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be so referred.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Under the circumstances I think I will ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the resolution must be referred. That is required by statute.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.